



CRM-M-73205 of 2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

347

CRM-M-73205 of 2025
Date of Decision: 28.01.2026

Amandeep Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Ravish Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aiman J. Chishti, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

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.10 dated 29.11.2025 registered under Section 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station NRI, District Moga.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner allegedly duped the complainant for a sum of Rs.5 lakhs by providing forged work visa of Singapore to her daughter-Soma Rani. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is carrying on the business of Visa Consultancy in the name of "M/s Aman Immigration" at Kotkapura, District Faridkot. He further argued

**CRM-M-73205 of 2025****-2-**

that the complainant approached to the petitioner for obtaining an Open Domestic Work Permit Visa of Singapore for her daughter-Soma Rani. Thereafter, on persual of the documents and educational qualifications, petitioner made it clear that Soma Rani can get Open Domestic Work Permit only for one year initially and she will be able to do some petty jobs only. The said position was also made clear to her brother-Manga Singh, who is already settled in Singapore. He argued that on 30.03.2025, work permit application of Soma Rani was approved by the Ministry of Manpower, Singapore, vide letter dated 30.03.2025 (Annexure P-3) and she was issued a work permit and visit pass, which was valid upto 06.04.2026 (Annexure P-4). Ultimately Soma Rani reached Singapore on 25.04.2025 on a valid visa. He further argued that the petitioner has neither concealed anything nor has provided any forged document to the complainant. He further argued that Soma Rani had got a nursing job illegally in Singapore, as the said job was not permissible on the Open Domestic Work Permit Visa. Thus, false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner and Soma Rani is still in Singapore. 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 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 her arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the

**CRM-M-73205 of 2025****-3-**

Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, vide order dated 16.12.2025.

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. She argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and has cheated and defrauded the complainant for a sum of Rs.5 lakhs by providing forged work permit visa of Singapore to her daughter-Soma Rani. She further argued that an amount of Rs.3,50,000/- was directly transferred into the account of the petitioner. She 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, she prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against her are serious in nature. She is alleged to have cheated and defrauded the complainant for a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- by providing forged work permit visa for Singapore to her daughter-Soma Rani. 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



CRM-M-73205 of 2025

-4-

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.

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

9. 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 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 enroled 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



CRM-M-73205 of 2025

-6-

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

10. 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.

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

28.01.2026*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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