



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

216

CRM-M-42239-2025

Date of decision: 19.08.2025

Manjinder Singh Kalsi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present : Mr. Arshdeep Singh Sivia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J.(ORAL)

1. Learned State counsel has filed the status report, which is taken on record.

2. In para 7 thereof, it has been mentioned that complainant compromised the dispute with the father of the petitioner, who transferred Rs.9.35 lakhs in his (complainant) account as also that complainant does not wish to initiate further proceedings against the present petitioner and the other accused.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant also endorses the factum of compromise.

4. Documents on record reveal that criminal proceedings in the present case were initiated on the basis of a written complaint lodged by complainant-Arshdeep Singh, who alleged that Gurdeep Singh Kalsi (brother of Petitioner) assured him (complainant) to send him abroad on study visa. For the said purpose, Rs.15 lakhs were paid by his parents (complainant parents). After some time, Gurdeep Singh Kalsi disclosed that



the authorities have refused to grant study visa and that he would still try to get a Work permit for him (complainant) for 5 years. Contrary to promise, only Visitor visa of UK was handed over. Complainant next alleged that even his passport and copy of statement of account in HDFC Bank were retained by Gurdeep Singh Kalsi, who is the main culprit, though his brother (present petitioner) and father-Sh. Davinder Singh Kalsi also rendered due assistance.

Based on this complaint, a formal case vide FIR No.51 dated 16.05.2025 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC (Sections 406, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 201 IPC) and Section 24 of Immigration Act, at Police Station P.A.U., Ludhiana was registered against Gurdeep Singh Kalsi, present petitioner and Davinder Singh Kalsi (father of petitioner).

5. Learned counsel submits that petitioner has been falsely arrayed as co-accused in the present case. All the allegations have been levelled against his brother-Gurdeep Singh Kalsi, who allegedly induced complainant to part with Rs.15 lakhs on the pretext of sending him abroad. The only role attributed to petitioner is that he rendered assistance to his brother (Gurdeep Singh Kalsi), who is the main accused. In complaint, complainant did not allege that present petitioner induced him to part with his hard-earned money on the ground that his son would be send abroad. Nonetheless, in the wake of compromise having been effected between complainant and the accused party, Rs.9.35 lakhs has been credited in the account of the complainant, who does not want any further proceedings against accused party.

In the wake of this development, learned counsel prays to take lenient view in favour of the petitioner, who has been in custody since 10.07.2025 and whose past antecedents was quite clean, as he is not



involved in any other case, by extending him the concession of bail.

6. No meaningful arguments were advanced by learned counsel for the complainant, who though, endorsed the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the complainant and the accused party, as also that in pursuance of the same Rs.9.35 lakhs were transferred to the account of complainant.

7. In the status report filed by the State today, the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties, during the stage of investigation has been highlighted in para 7 thereof. Affidavit of complainant (appended as Annexure P-3) and statement of account (appended as Annexure P-4) also support the stand of petitioner with regard to compromise having been effected between the parties. In view of the same, as also considering that no specific allegations were levelled by complainant against the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that further incarceration of petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, lenient view is taken in favour of the petitioner, who is granted the concession of bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, who may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. The present petition accordingly stands allowed. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid condition, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be



construed as an opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

19.08.2025

Hemant

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