



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

CRM-M-17659-2025

Date of Decision : April 01, 2025

SANDEEP GIR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present : Mr. L.M.Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.85 dated 17.10.2024 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, lateron added Sections 467/468/471 of IPC, registered at Police Station Julkan, District Patiala.

2. The brief facts of the case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“As per the contents of the FIR, the present case has been registered against the petitioner and others on the application moved by the complainant Prem Singh to the SSP Patiala. He has stated in the application that Sandeep Gir and Kuldeep Singh told him that they are doing the business of sending the persons abroad, under the name at style of M/s Jai Maa Trading Company at Pehowa and their friend Surinder Singh is owner of the same. On 16.1.2024 complainant alongwith Sandeep Gir went to Pehowa and met with Kuldeep and

Khushi Ram and showed his intention to go to Australia. Surinder Singh, owner, was also present there at that time. Sandeep Gir assured the complainant that they will send him Australia soon and demanded Rs. 23 lacs from him. Accordingly, on 16.1.2024 complainant paid Rs.3 lacs to Khushi Ram in the presence of Sandeep Gir and Kuldeep Singh. On 22.2.2024 Sandeep Gir asked him to transfer Rs.14 lacs in the account of Khushi Ram and as such, brother of the complainant, namely, Zora Singh, transferred the said amount in his account and thereafter, Khushi Ram issued receipt for the same on the letter head of their firm. The accused persons further assured the complainant to send him to Australia upto 31.3.2024. On 27.3.2024 Sandeep Gir called the complainant and one more person, namely, Eknor Singh, to Delhi on the pretext of sending them to Australia and they were stayed in Hotel Gross Stay, Mahipalpur, Delhi, from 27.3.2024 till 12.4.2024. One companion of Sandeep Gir, namely, Sanju Chaudhary, gave visa and other documents to the complainant, stating that his visa for Australia has been arranged for three years and demanded Rs.3 lacs for booking of ticket and the remaining amount was to be paid on reaching Australia. Thereafter, Zora Singh, Kuldeep Singh and Gurtej Singh paid Rs. 3 lacs to wife of Surinder Singh, as per his asking. On 12.4.2024 Sanju Chaudhary told the complainant that his visa has been cancelled, on which the complainant returned home and tried to contact the accused persons, but they did not attend his calls. On 26.4.2024 complainant alongwith Kuldeep Singh, Gurtej Singh and Zora Singh meet Khushi Ram at his house and demanded the money back, he did not return the amount, rather extended threats to them. Thus, the accused persons had cheated him to the tune of about Rs.20 lacs. Accordingly, the complainant prayed for taking action against the accused persons.”

3. Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 27.11.2024 passed in CRM-M-59116-2024 (Annexure P-2) by this Court for an offence under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, FIR No.85 dated 17.10.2024 while observing that there is no incriminating material available with the prosecution to connect the petitioner with the alleged commission of offence and nothing is to be recovered from his possession.

Considering these facts, the petitioner was directed to join the investigation but subsequently offences under Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC stand added in the FIR on 19.1.2025 and the petitioner approached the trial Court seeking bail for the said offences, which has been declined on 24.3.2025 vide Annexure P-4.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who does not controvert the aforesaid fact but opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground.

4. Analysis

Having regard to the order passed by this Court on an earlier occasion Annexure P-2 vide which the petitioner was admitted to anticipatory bail for the offences under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and now the offences under Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC stands added would clearly depict that

the same revolves in the form of documentary evidence, which needs to be decided and examined but for the same, the custodial interrogation can not be considered to be must and essential. Such information can be extracted on interrogation in case the petitioner cooperates with the investigating agency for the said purpose.

At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions from the petitioner undertakes to join the investigation within 7 days from today for the offences under Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC as well.

5. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

- (i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- (ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

April 01, 2025
ajay-1

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