



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

210

CRM-M-7647-2025

Date of decision: May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

Raj Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Ms. Aarti Sharma and Jitender Ranga, Advocates  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Assistant Advocate General,  
Haryana.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.68 dated 12.03.2024 under Sections 406, 420 of the IPC and Sections 10 and 24 of The Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents and it is, therefore, evident that he has been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly obtaining ₹7 lakh (₹5 lakh through documented bank transaction and ₹2 lakh through cash) from the complainant on a false assurance that he would arrange for his son's VISA for England. Learned counsel has contended that the entire case of the prosecution is based on the alleged monetary transactions between the parties, which are now part of the challan, hence, there can be no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with evidence in case he is enlarged on bail. It has

been further submitted that even otherwise, the only role attributed to the petitioner in the FIR in question is of having introduced the complainant to co-accused Kiranpal, who had then in turn assured the complainant to arrange for the VISA of the complainant's son for England. Learned counsel has submitted that in the aforementioned circumstances, as the trial would take considerable time to conclude, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has he, on instructions, disputed that the entire case of the prosecution primarily rests on documentary evidence, which is already part of the challan. It has also been submitted, on further instructions, that charges have already been framed in the present case against the petitioner, however, prosecution evidence is yet to commence. On further instructions, learned State counsel has submitted that co-accused Kiranpal, who is the prime accused, is still at large.

4. On a pointed query, learned State counsel, on instructions, has not contested that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 22.07.2024. The only role attributed to the petitioner is of having introduced the complainant with co-accused Kiranpal on an assurance given that the VISA for England would be arranged for the complainant's son.

The trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future as prosecution evidence is yet to commence.

7. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

**May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025**  
*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No