



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

211

CRM-M-46739-2024

Date of decision: January 10th, 2025

Mandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Rajinder Kumar Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.58 dated 03.05.2024 under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. When the instant petition came up for the first time before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner had at the outset submitted that the possibility of an amicable settlement with the complainant could be attempted, as a result of which, the parties were then referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. As per report received from the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, the parties, however, failed to arrive at an amicable settlement.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not disputed that as many as seven adjournments were given by the Mediation and

Conciliation Centre to the petitioner for making good the payment received by him from the complainant in lieu of an assurance given that he would arrange his VISA and travel to Italy.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has on merits submitted that false and fabricated allegations have been levelled against the petitioner of giving the alleged assurance to the complainant's son of arranging his travel and VISA to Italy. It has been submitted that the case is exclusively triable by Magistrate.

5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and this is not the first time that he has duped innocent and vulnerable people into parting with huge sums of money on the pretext of arranging their VISA and travel abroad. It has been also submitted that it is a matter of record that the petitioner is facing trial in three other criminal cases, including a case of identical nature, however, since the petitioner had effected a compromise in one of the cases, the FIR registered against him under Sections 406, 420 of the IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, had been quashed on the basis of a compromise.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. *Prima facie*, there are specific allegations against the petitioner, who indeed comes across as a habitual offender and has been taking vulnerable and innocent people for a ride after giving them the lure of greener pastures abroad.

8. In the fact and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. The instant petition stands dismissed.

10. 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.

January 10th, 2025

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No