



101

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-62349-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 16.04.2026**

SATISH KUMAR**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER**.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Pranav Chadha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate, and
Mr. Shamsher Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant/respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0309, dated 31.08.2025, under Sections 34, 406, 420 of IPC and section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal.

2. As per the allegations, complainant-Jitender Singh, had discussions with the accused persons, namely Satish (present petitioner) and Pawan, regarding facilitating the travel of his brothers, namely Sushil and Arvind, to the United States of America for a consideration of Rs.28 lacs each. It is alleged that, in the same month, a sum of Rs.27.25 lacs was paid to the accused persons along with the passports and other relevant documents of both individuals. However, till July 2025, neither of the complainant's brothers was sent abroad, nor the amount was refunded.

Subsequently, a settlement was arrived at between the parties, pursuant to which an amount of Rs.9,50,000/- was returned out of

Rs.27.50 lakhs, and for the remaining amount, certain cheques were issued in favour of the complainant. However, the balance amount of Rs.17.75 lacs still remains unpaid by the accused persons.

3. During the course of investigation, it emerged that an individual, namely Gopal Haridass Goswami, was involved, in whose bank account the aforesaid amount was deposited. It has also been found that a sum of Rs.8,98,000/- was transferred back from the said account to the bank account of the petitioner. Furthermore, during the inquiry, a compromise was arrived at, wherein the petitioner undertook to repay the amount to the complainant party.

4. In this regard, affidavits dated 03.04.2025 (Annexures R-2/1 and R-2/2) have already been placed on record by learned counsel for the complainant.

5. It is evident that a substantial amount was received from the complainant, and despite partial repayment, petitioner has failed to honour his commitment. Neither the remaining amount has been repaid, nor the purpose for which the money was obtained, by allegedly inducing the complainant, had been fulfilled.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, as detailed here above, as well as in the status report dated 09.04.2026, and considering the bank transactions attributed to the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the matter requires thorough investigation. Accordingly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, present petition is dismissed.

7. Investigating Officer is directed to proceed further, in accordance with law.

16.04.2026

Lavisha

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*