



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

131

**CRM-M-64115-2025
Date of decision: 12.03.2026**

GURVINDER SINGH ALIAS GURWINDER SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. S.K. Sinha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 218 dated 25.12.2024, registered under Section(s) 316(2), 318(4), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 10 & 24 of Immigration Act, 2023 at Police Station Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra.

2. Succinctly stated, the facts leading to the registration of the present FIR are that the complainant, Mandeep Singh son of Jasbir Singh, desired to travel abroad and he came into contact with Paramjeet Singh son of Baldev Singh, resident of Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra, who was running

an IELTS and immigration centre under the name and style of “Combridge Education Immigration Point, Ismailabad.” It is alleged that the complainant entered into discussions with the said Paramjeet Singh, who, in September 2024, called the complainant to his office, where he allegedly introduced him to the present petitioner along with Anmol Kaur Sandhu and Neha Rana. During the said interaction, Anmol Kaur Sandhu and Neha Rana represented to the complainant that they were operating two branches in Chandigarh and assured him that they would legitimately facilitate his immigration to Canada. On the basis of the aforesaid representations, a deal was allegedly finalized by Paramjeet Singh in consultation with Anmol Kaur Sandhu, Neha Rana and Gurwinder Singh, whereby the complainant agreed to pay a sum of Rs.14 lakhs for the purpose of arranging his travel abroad. Pursuant thereto, the complainant handed over his passport and other relevant documents to Paramjeet Singh, who allegedly passed the same on to the present petitioner. However, it is alleged that when the overseas PPR (Passport Request) document pertaining to the complainant was subsequently checked by Paramjeet Singh, the same was found to be fake, leading to the lodging of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner neither induced the complainant nor received any amount from him. It is contended that the entire payment was allegedly made to co-accused Paramjeet Singh, to whom the complainant had also handed over his passport and other documents. Counsel further submits that although the petitioner has been nominated in certain other FIRs as well, he has already been granted bail in nearly 10 out of approximately 17 such cases. It is also contended that the

petitioner has been in custody since 17.02.2025 and no prosecution evidence has been recorded so far, indicating that the trial is likely to take a considerable period of time to conclude.

4. The learned State Counsel has referred to the status report filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Pehowa, which is taken on record. In the said report, it has been averred that the petitioner is involved in the commission of the alleged offence and that, during the course of custody, he admitted his involvement in his disclosure statement. It is further alleged that a sum of Rs.32,000/- was recovered from the petitioner, and that he had acted in concert with the other co-accused in duping the complainant. The period of custody and the stage of the trial are, however, not disputed.

5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and upon considering the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of custody already undergone by him as well as the fact that the trial before the Magistrate is yet to commence and further taking note of the arguable issues regarding the alleged inducement and delivery of passport to the petitioner, which are matters to be determined during the course of trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MARCH 12, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No