



125

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

**CRM-M No.65422 of 2025
Date of Decision: 23.03.2026**

Varinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Manbir Singh Basra, Advocate and
Mr. Anupinder Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ankush Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.165, dated 05.06.2025, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Rajwinder Kaur w/o Avtar Singh. It was alleged that son of complainant, namely, Gursewak Singh and Simran, son of Varinder Singh (petitioner), are friends. Simran told the son of complainant, namely, Gursewak Singh



that he along with his father will send him to Poland. Thereafter, they took Gursewak Singh to Dubai and there, they demanded the amount of Rs.10,25,000/- in order to send him to Poland and they also demanded an amount of Rs.20,000/- for medical. The complainant paid all the amount online to the accused but he never sent her son to Poland. Simran also taken away the passport of the son of complainant. Gursewak Singh demanded the money back from Simran, but he refused to do the same. Neither Gursewak Singh was sent to abroad nor his money was returned. Simran and his father, namely, Varinder Singh threatened to eliminate the complainant and Gursewak Singh and told that they will falsely implicate them in a false case. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 08.07.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Gurdaspur praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Judge, Special Court, Gurdaspur dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 08.08.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-48107-2025 and CRM-M-55559-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 04.09.2025 and 09.10.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third petition. However, it is apposite to mention here that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 29.11.2025 due to his medical



condition and till date, he is on interim bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that from the case of the prosecution, it is apparent that the allegations of taking the money from the complainant on the pretext of sending her son to Poland are against the son of the petitioner, namely, Simran. He has submitted that the petitioner is not involved in the alleged offence. He has submitted that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 29.11.2025 as he is suffering from chronic liver disease and is under regular check up. He has submitted that the petitioner has not misused the concession of interim bail granted to him vide order dated 29.11.2025 and thus, in the facts and circumstances and keeping in view his health condition, he prays that the interim bail granted to the petitioner be made absolute.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner along with his son had duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.10,45,000/-. He has submitted that son of the petitioner, namely, Simran is at large and he has been declared as proclaimed offender. He has thus submitted that no case for the grant of bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Status report dated 21.03.2026 by way of an affidavit of Sanjeev Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division City Batala, Police District Batala on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court, which is taken on record.



Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner along with his son had committed the offence of cheating with the complainant on the pretext of sending her son to Poland and on account of the same, thus, had received an amount of Rs.10,45,000/- from the complainant. She has submitted that neither the son of complainant was sent to abroad nor the amount has been returned. She has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in 02 other cases of similar nature. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. A perusal of the status report filed would show that the certificate of chronic disease was obtained from Shrimann Superspeciality Hospital about the medical condition and treatment of petitioner and as per the certificate, the petitioner Varinder Singh son of Amrik Singh is suffering from chronic liver disease with ascites and requires routine close follow up and care with superspecialist doctors (Gastroenterology/Hepatology). The petitioner also requires repeat endoscopy/ERCP for bile duct stones and possible need of liver transplantation has been explained to family.

7. It is apparent that the doctors had advised Liver transplantation to the family of the petitioner.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds that there being no adverse record concluding that the petitioner has misused the concession of interim bail, thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the

interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 29.11.2025 is made absolute to his already furnished surety/bail bonds before the trial Court and the same shall be treated as alive till the final disposal of the trial. The petitioner is directed to keep on appearing before the trial Court as and when required to do so and also to comply with the direction of the trial Court given by it during the pendency of the trial.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.03.2026	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
<i>rittu</i>	JUDGE
Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No