IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-72485-2025
Date of decision: 05.02.2026

AMAN KUMAR ......Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ....Respondent

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

*****

Present: - Mr. Akshit Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Shivam Chaudhary, Advocate
for the complainant.

*****

<u>VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)</u>

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.452 dated 16.11.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Ladwa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Briefly summarized, the case of the prosecution as mentioned in the order of the trial Court reads thus:-

"....... that complaint No.753-KB, dated 27.09.2025, moved by complainant Jaipal son of Hariram, resident of Village Bakali, District Kurukshetra was received in the police

station, in which the complainant has alleged that he is a labourer by profession. He further alleged that his son Gurmeet Singh wanted to go Singapore, for which he contacted many immigration centres. Complainant further alleged that one day Aman Kumar (applicant-accused) called his son Gurmeet Singh from mobile No.79880-20153, who told his son that they deal in the business of immigration. Complainant further alleged that after some days, Aman Kumar along with his brother Amit Kumar came at his house in a car and Aman Kumar showed his ID card, by stating that the same has been issued by Government of India and he is a registered agent. Complainant further alleged that said Amit Kumar introduced himself as ITI Instructor. He further alleged that both Aman Kumar and Amit Kumar assured him that they will provide a good job for his son in Singapore. He thus, had agreed to send his son Singapore through Aman Kumar and Amit Kumar and deal was finalized in Rs.7,00,000/-. He further alleged that his some other relatives namely Sukhdev Singh and Sahil were also wanted to Singapore, so he, also given their mobile numbers to Aman Kumar. Complainant further alleged that on 31.05.2025, on asking of applicant-accused Aman Kumar, he got transferred Rs.5,000/- through 'google-pay' from the bank account of his son Rajat. He further alleged that after some days, one girl namely Neha called him, who stated herself wife of Aman Kumar and told to him that she is supervising the immigration work of her husband. She further told that visa of his son for Singapore has come and she asked to transfer Rs.1,00,000/- in their account. Thereafter, he verified this fact from Aman Kumar and thereafter, he got transferred Rs.1,00,000/- from the bank account of his relative Nishant in the bank account, given by said Neha. Complainant further alleged that on 28.08.2025, Aman Kumar, Amit Kumar and Neha came at his house and showed them visa and air ticket for 04.07.2025 of his son Gurmeet Singh to them. At that time his relatives, Sukhdev Singh and Sahil were also present there and in their presence,

> *he gave Rs.4,50,000/-, original passport of his son to Aman Kumar, Amit Kumar and Neha. He further alleged that on 04.07.2025, flight of his son could not be confirmed and Aman Kumar further demanded Rs.1,50,000/- from him for booking of ticket again. He further alleged that after some days, he gave Rs.1,50,000/- to Aman Kumar and he returned the passport of his son. However, on 01.08.2025, he came to know that Aman Kumar was caught by the police of Yamunanager in a case of fraud. Thereafter, he got checked the air ticket of his son and the same was found fake. Complainant further alleged that the accused have received amount of Rs.7,05,000/- from him fraudulently on the false assurance of sending his son abroad."*

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by way of a fabricated complaint with respect to payment of Rs. 7.05 lakhs, whereas, in fact only an amount of Rs. 1.05 lakhs has been received in his account. He further contends that the petitioner had no connection whatsoever with the alleged false assurance purportedly given to the son of the complainant. No written document in support of the allegations has been produced by the complainant at any point in time. It is further submitted that the entire case is based upon documentary evidence, and therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

4. Per contra, counsel for the respondent-State as well as the complainant contend that pursuant to assurance given by the petitioner for securing overseas employment for the son of the complainant in Singapore, an amount of Rs. 7.05 lakhs had been paid. While the amount of Rs. 1.05 lakhs was paid through banking transactions, the remaining amount of Rs. 6 lakhs was paid in two different installments of Rs. 4.50 lakhs and Rs. 1.50

lakhs in cash in the presence of the witnesses. It is contended that the petitioner handed over an air ticket which was later found to be forged. It is further submitted that the petitioner is engaged in the aforesaid business and a large number of cases have already been registered against him for similar offences. The details of the five other cases detailed out as under:-

> *"1. FIR No. 224 of 2025, Under Section 316(2), 318(4), BNS, P.S. Radaur, District Yamuna Nagar. (Joined investigation on Bail).*
>
> *2. FIR No. 670 of 2023, Under Section 406, 420 IPC P.S. City Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar. (Join investigation on Bail).*
>
> *3. FIR No. 164 of 2025, Under Section 316(2), 318(4), BNS, P.S. Sector-17, Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar. (Did not join investigation).*
>
> *4. FIR No. 587 of 2025, Under Section 316(2), 318(4), BNS, P.S. Indri, District Karnal (Did not join investigation).*
>
> *5. FIR No. 74 dated 23.04.2025, Under Sections 315(2), 318 (4), 316(2), BNS & Sections 10 and 24 of the Immigration Act at Police Station Farakhpur, Yamuna Nagar."*

5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. It is evident that there are specific allegations against the petitioner for having received the money for sending the son of the complainant to Singapore and to secure him a work visa. The involvement of the petitioner in large number of similar cases (06 in total) clearly shows that

he has indulged in similar operations and has thus allured large number of person on false pretext of sending abroad.

7. However, this Court would not loose sight of the fact that the people who are travelling abroad are actually not seeking assurances from the Travel Agents. Merely because no such written documentation was there would not be sufficient to belie the allegations of the complainant at this stage, more so, when the petitioner himself acknowledges his relationship with the respondent-complainant and also admits of having received the money in his account from the complainant.

8. I do not find that there are sufficient circumstances which may indicate towards innocence of the petitioner. The mere fact that the petitioner is involved in large number of cases and such an offence would involve large number of persons for which an in depth investigation is required to be conducted, I am of the opinion that grant of anticipatory bail is likely to influence the investigation to be conducted properly.

9. Finding no merits, the present petition is dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

FEBRUARY 05, 2026 **JUDGE**

Vishal Sharma

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