



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

231

CRM-M-74122-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.01.2026

Sandeep Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana
assisted by SI Surinder Sharma 04/DDR.

Mr. Rahul Gahlia, Advocate for
Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 370, 384, 420, 34 of Indian Penal Code and Section 24 of Emigration Act, 1983, the FIR No.129 dated 17.09.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Bond Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri. In the abovementioned case, the petitioner is apprehending arrest, and therefore, for the benefit of anticipatory bail he has approached this Court by virtue of present petition under Section 482 of BNSS.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the complaint of 'Ankit S/o Yudhveer Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the



complainant that in January, 2024, his Kabaddi Coach, namely Arvind Narwal @Kala, told him that he had arranged work permit & accommodation in foreign countries for thousands of co-villagers, and that he could do the same for the complainant also. As per complainant, convinced with the claim made by Arvind Narwal @Kala, he entered into a deal with Arvind Narwal @Kala, Ram Singh and Ankit and paid them Rs.11,00,000/-. According to complainant, on 05.08.2024, he was sent to Amsterdam, and on 07.08.2024, to Suriname, where Ram Singh's agents Sandeep and Sonu locked him in a room, thrashed him and snatched dollars equivalent to Rs.11,00,000/-. It was alleged by the complainant that his passport was also snatched by the above-named persons and a threat to kill was also given.

3. It was further alleged by the complainant that the above-named assailants had called his home, in response to which his uncle paid Rs.15,00,000/- to Arvind Narwal @Kala and Ram Singh under the assurance that the petitioner would be sent to USA through legal channel. According to complainant, he was left with no option and therefore, from Suriname he went to Ghana, Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Columbia. The complainant further alleged that in Columbia, he was beaten up by the agents of Sonu and Sandeep and another sum of Rs.10,00,000/- was collected by Arvind Narwal @Kala, Ram Singh and Ankit from the uncle of complainant, and thereafter, he was sent to Panama, then to Costa Rica and ultimately to Mexico. It is the claim of the petitioner that in Mexico, he was again beaten-up and thereafter, another sum of Rs.7,70,000/- was extorted from his uncle at Sonipat.



4. As per complainant, once the abovementioned money was paid, the above-mentioned agents on gun-point got him, entered in USA boundary, where he was arrested by USA Border Patrol and kept in custody for 09 months. In view of above, it was alleged by the complainant that despite the receipt of huge amount of money, he was not sent to America through legal channels, and thus, he has been subjected to fraud and cheating.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case has been lodged and the investigation taken up.

6. The learned State Counsel has filed the status report. The same be taken on record.

7. Heard.

8. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the allegations against the petitioner are false on the face of it as there is very specific allegation against the petitioner that being agent of Arvind Narwal @Kala, he had met the complainant in Suriname. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has never visited Suriname, and this fact stands verified from the Passport of the petitioner, wherein the visit of Suriname is not recorded by the immigration Agency. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, altogether false allegations have been leveled against the petitioner, and therefore, he is entitled for benefit of anticipatory bail.

9. The learned State Counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, allegations against the petitioner are



quite specific, and that this question is to be decided during the course of trial only as to whether the petitioner had ever visited the Suriname or not. As per learned State Counsel, at this stage custodial interrogation of the petitioner is of utmost importance to unearth the racket involved in the abovementioned illegal activities.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for the decision: -

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he kept the complainant in custody in Suriname and extorted money from his uncle, but as per the submissions made by learned State Counsel, the Investigating Agency has verified and found this claim to be true that the petitioner has never visited Suriname;
- iii) that there is nothing on record to show that the money was ever paid by the complainant or his family members to the petitioner either in cash or through bank transactions;
- iv) that there is nothing on record to show that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- v) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.



12. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

13. In view of the above-mentioned discussion, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner is accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail. It is hereby directed that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer. The petitioner will join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

14. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

19.01.2026
Gaurav Thakur

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