



CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.02.2026

Amardeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate and
Mr. Yajat Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jasvinder Singh Saini, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

CRM-316-2026

This application has been filed for placing on record the reply on behalf of the complainant along with Annexure R-1.

Application is allowed, as prayed for and the reply as well as the Annexure R-1 are ordered to be taken on record.

Main Case

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.239 dated 17.11.2025 registered under Sections 120-B, 406 and 420 of IPC and Sections 10/24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station Ismailabad,

**CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -2-**

District Kurukshetra.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with co-accused duped the complainant for a sum of Rs.41 lakhs on the pretext of sending him abroad. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the present FIR was registered after an unexplained delay of more than 07 months, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He submits that the firm Visa Scout Immigration was shut in the year 2023 and therefore, the same was not in existence at the time of registration of the FIR. He argued that the petitioner and the complainant were friends and some petty bank transactions were done on account of their personal relations which were not intended for facilitating immigration. He submits that earlier, the petitioner was granted the benefit of anticipatory bail by the learned trial Court, vide order dated 26.11.2025 but later on, the same was dismissed, vide order dated 02.12.2025. He further argued that the complainant himself had gone to America by adopting a route of his own choice and the petitioner has no concern with the route adopted by the petitioner. He further argued that the petitioner has neither concealed anything nor has provided any forged document to the complainant. Thus, false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. He submitted that the petitioner has been deported from USA and present FIR is filed only to extort money from the petitioner. He further submits that the offences are triable by Magistrate only. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as she is not involved in any other case. Learned counsel

**CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -3-**

for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, vide order dated 02.12.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and has cheated and defrauded the complainant for a sum of Rs.41,00,000/-. He further argued that during investigation, the petitioner suffered a disclosure statement that he has partnership with co-accused Hardeep Singh, thereby admitting that he was active partner in Visa Scout Immigration. In his disclosure statement, the petitioner admitted his involvement in the crime and also admitted that he will return the amount of Rs.41 lakhs to the complainant. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a fair and proper investigation in the matter as well as to unearth the modus operandi of accused and to effect recovery of the amount involved in the alleged fraud. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of

**CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -4-**

anticipatory bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail. He further submitted that the petitioner admitted to return Rs.15 lakhs before Panchayat, which itself establishes his involvement in the crime.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against him are serious in nature. He is alleged to have cheated and defrauded the complainant for a sum of Rs.41,00,000/- on the pretext of sending him abroad. The petitioner in his disclosure statement admitted the factum of partnership with co-accused Hardeep Singh and also admitted his involvement in the crime and agreed to return the amount. The events in entirety indicate towards the existence of a bigger syndicate indulging in dubious immigration activities as a result of which, innocent victims end up being preyed upon by such illusory tactics. The Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding



CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -5-

individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of



CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -6-

the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroped in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".

Economic Offences

*78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*

XXX XXX XXX

83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate



CRM-M-69514 of 2025 (O&M) -7-

and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.

11. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

12. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

04.02.2026
D.Bansal

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