



CRM-M-61149-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

137

CRM-M-61149-2025
Decided on: 25.03.2026

Puneet Pahwa

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Garg, Advocate
None for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Jangra, Advocate
for the complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.251 dated 11.09.2025, under Section 420 IPC and Section 24 of Immigraton Act at Police Station Sahnewal, District Ludhiana.

2. On 31.10.2025, following order was passed:

“(i) *** ***)

(ii) *Allegations against the petitioner are that he has been running an immigration office and, under the pretext of sending Kulwant (son of the complainant, Sukhdev) and one Parveen to the United Kingdom on a work visa for a film project, received a sum of ₹15 lakhs after finalizing the deal for ₹30 lakhs. However, neither were the individuals sent abroad, nor was the amount returned.*

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the actual amount paid to the petitioner was ₹5,10,000 for a photoshoot, which was credited to the petitioner's



CRM-M-61149-2025

account, and another sum of ₹5,00,000 was credited to the account of one Amit Vij in Mumbai. Since the deal could not materialize, an amount of ₹3,00,000 has already been refunded to the complainant, which fact has even been acknowledged in the FIR.

In support of his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the photographs (Annexures P-2 and P-3) placed on record to demonstrate, on a prima facie basis, the true nature of the transaction. Therefore, counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail, submitting that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation, provided he is granted protection from arrest.

(iii) Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent – State. He seeks some time to file status report.

(iv) List on 20.01.2026.

(v) In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

(vi) Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though for visiting abroad (Dubai), petitioner had sought permission from this Court and despite granting of the said permission, petitioner did not avail the concession as he could not deposit the security of Rs. 15 lacs in the shape of FDR as was directed by this Court.

However, submits that during pendency of present petition, petitioner has resolved the dispute with the complainant/victim and has also joined investigation. On filing of compromise quashing petition, direction to record statements of the respective parties were issued by this Court and thereupon



CRM-M-61149-2025

required statements have also been recorded before the Court below on 16.03.2026. Thus, submits that once petitioner has already joined investigation and dispute in itself has also been compromised, there is no point for subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation, thus, prays for confirmation of the order 31.10.2025.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of joining of investigation on 02.01.2026 and counsel for the complainant also endorsed the correctness of factum of compromise and recording of statements of the parties after resolving the dispute amicably.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 31.10.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

9. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

25.03.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
~~YES~~/NO