



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134

CRM-M-69604-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.04.2026

Parminder Singh @ Ashu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Tanvir Singh Attariwala, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Verma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. Joginder Pal Devgan, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.187 dated 28.08.2025, registered under Sections 417, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 66-D/67-D of the Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Division B, District Amritsar.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of one Sukhpal Singh, a property dealer, who alleged that on 10.07.2020, the petitioner met him and sought a rental accommodation for himself, whereupon, the complainant arranged a suitable rental accommodation on a monthly rent of Rs.9,000/- per month. The petitioner showed inclination in buying the said rented house/kothi and on that pretext the complainant and the petitioner started dealing with each other. It was further alleged by the complainant that the

petitioner told him that he was acquainted with one lady Dr. Nagraj Salani, whose's son-in-law owned various KFC stores and he could facilitate the purchase of a franchise of KFC in the name of complainant. The complainant further stated that pursuant thereto he started receiving emails from one email Id: kfcmadhav8@gmail.com on 23.03.2021 and a sum of Rs.12,000/- was taken by the petitioner. It is further averred by the complainant that an amount of Rs.78 lakhs approximately was handed over by him to the petitioner herein on the pretext of securing a KFC franchise but neither any such franchise was made available nor the money was returned, which led to registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by levelling false and frivolous allegations. He contends that even though an allegation has been levelled that a huge amount of Rs. 78 lakhs approximately had been paid by the complainant to the petitioner, however, the statement of accounts reveal transactions to the tune of Rs.92,000/- only. He further contends that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and has been in custody since 29.08.2025 and thus has undergone an actual custody of nearly 07 months. He submits that the charges have not been framed so far and a total of 21 prosecution witnesses are to be examined, hence, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. He further submits that all the offences are triable by the Court of a Magistrate, hence, his custodial interrogation is not warranted. He further contends that there is a delay of more than 04 years in lodging the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the

aforesaid factual aspects.

5. Counsel for the complainant vehemently contends that the petitioner had duped the complainant of a huge sum of money and a fake email Id had been generated by him for the purpose of defrauding the complainant on the basis whereof the complainant had been allured for parting with his money.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the arguable issues with respect to the amount allegedly paid to him for arranging a KFC franchise, the period of actual custody undergone by him, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

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

9. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

01.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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