



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

215

CRM-M-23384-2025

Date of decision: 16th September, 2025

Gurjit Singh @ Gurjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikram Jeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 40 dated 01.04.2024 registered under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC at Police Station Machhiwara, District Ludhiana.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Rattan Kumar alleging that the petitioner and the co-accused Sukhwinder Singh had duped him of a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- on the premise of sending him to USA via Dubai and settling him there. They had got issued visa for Dubai for him. He was made to stay illegally for a period of three months there and apprehending that he could be arrested due to his illegal stay, he had managed to come back. The



petitioner and co-accused did not give his money back on demand and had caused wrongful loss to him. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and has been in custody since 19.09.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since 19.09.2024. He had given an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- to the complainant. No money had been deposited by the complainant in his bank account. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender since he is involved in four other cases of similar nature. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- on the premise of sending him to USA. He has placed on record a copy of sworn deposition of the complainant which shows that an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- had been given by the petitioner to the complainant. The trial has commenced but will take considerable time to conclude. The involvement of the petitioner in other cases which are also triable by Magistrate, cannot be considered to be a ground for denying



benefit of bail to him in this case. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the period of his incarceration and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner on bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

16th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*