

2026:PHHC:026950



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

119

CRM-M-67744-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.02.2026

RAVINDER SINGH ALIAS RAVI SAAB

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF U.T. CHANDIGARH

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Jawnda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-6109-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

The reply on behalf of the complainant is ordered to be taken on record subject to all just exceptions. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place of the paper book.

MAIN CASE

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in FIR No.04 dated 05.01.2025 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC (Challan presented under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC only) registered at Police Station Central Sector 17, Chandigarh.

The case of the prosecution is that in the present case four complainants have made a complaint that a total amount of Rs.13,61,000/- has been taken by the petitioner from them on the pretext of sending them abroad.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are general and vague. The petitioner had just helped in processing

the file of the complainants. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 07 months.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh accepts notice and vehemently opposed the petition on the ground that there are 16 more cases of similar nature against the petitioner. The petitioner is running an immigration consultant agency in the name of B.B. Council, Sector 17, Chandigarh and he is systemically duping innocent persons people and grabbing their hard-earned money. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and as such, does not deserve the concession of regular bail. He places on record the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. As per the said certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 07 months and 04 days.

Mr. P.S. Hundal, Sr. Advocate appears alongwith Mr. Kanwar Harjinder Singh and Mr. J.S. Brar, Advocate on behalf of the complainant and vehemently opposed the petition on the lines of learned State Counsel.

I have heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and have gone through the documents and other material available on record meticulously.

It is well settled principle of law that while considering a petition for regular bail, the Court must consider the *prima facie case* against the petitioner and the gravity of offence as well. Apparently, the petitioner is alleged to be involved in 16 more cases of similar nature. Meaning thereby, the petitioner is involved in the business of cheating innocent persons and grabbing their hard-earned money. *Prima facie*, the allegations against the petitioner are very serious. Hence, keeping in view the nature of offence and his involvement in various other cases of similar nature, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Dismissed.

FEBRUARY 19, 2026.

Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No