

2025:PHHC:080334



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

CRM M-33866-2025

Date of Decision:04.07.2025

Renu @ Renu Goswami ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate, for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to her in case FIR No.86 dated 29.04.2025 registered under Section 420 of IPC at Police Station City Nawanshahr, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of the complaint submitted by Prabhjot Singh son of Sham Sunder and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Application No. 258-Peshi, Dated 10.03.2025. Office of Senior Superintendent of Police, PC Branch, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar. To, The Ld. Senior Superintendent

of Police, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar. Subject: Complaint against Renu Step to Success, Faridkot (98884-61882), Neha Step to Success (75089-28585) Chandigarh for committing fraud. Sir, it is requested that I Prabhjot Singh son of Sham Sunder, am resident of Arya Samaj Road, Nawanshahr. I am working as Assistant General Manager, Visionway, IELTS and Immigration Private Limited. My company deals in study VISA and tourist VISA. Many sub agents are associated with the company, who works with us on commission basis and supply files to us and based on the said supplied documents, we applied their VISAs. We do not charge any file charges on the cases submitted by the Sub Agents. In the same manner, Renu, Step to Success, Faridkot and Neha Step to Success, Chandigarh are already working with us. That in August 2023, they came to our office at Nawanshahr and have talked with us in detail. Thereafter, in September 2023, they had sent us one file, through e-mail, pertaining to Rimple daughter of Sukhdev Singh, resident of 14/1032, Mandir Wala Cross, Sultanwind Road, Amritsar, for applying the study VISA for England. That this mail was sent to us by Neha of Step to Success, Chandigarh Office, the copy of which is attached herewith. Pertaining to the VISA of Rimple, the entire talk was done by Neha and the requisite documents, which were required pertaining to the file, were supplied to us by Neha. Thereafter, we have arranged for the offer letter pertaining to the file sent by them and had shown the funds etc. of the student. That it was conveyed to us by Neha that this file is to be done as package and as per the package, we had to show the fee

for one year, insurance for one year and funds of 14,00,000/- and thereafter, the company of Neha was to make payment of 18,00,000/- to us on receipt of the VISA. Thereafter, we had shown the one-year fee, insurance for one year and funds of 14,00,000/-for Rimple and thereafter, the cash letter of the student had come. It is pertinent to mention here that earlier there was one dispute of our company with Neha and Renu with regard to non-payment of the amount and we had submitted one complaint against Neha and Renu and in compromise of the same, they have returned us earlier amount and they have conveyed us for not processing the case of Rimple whereas, we had already sent the fee of Rimple and the Cash Letter had also come. Thereafter, we had talked with Rimple and she had conveyed that the case may not be processed. Thereafter, we came to know that file of Rimple had been processed by Renu and Neha from their office of Step to Success at Chandigarh as the mail of Rimple was opened with us and we came to know that as there were wrong documents in the file of Rimple, she had been banned for 10 years and our company was not at fault in this regard. But now, they are not returning our fee and the amount of funds paid by us. Renu and Neha, in connivance with each other, had given us the case of Ms. Rimple and they had supplied forged documents and in this manner, they had tried to defame our company Visionway IELTS and Immigration Private Limited and had caused us financial loss and had unlawfully obtained profit and had prepared forged documents and had attached the same with the file and they had conveyed us that these documents are originals.

That action may be taken against them for fabrication of forged documents, submission of forged documents to the Embassy and by committing fraud in connivance with each other and for committing fraud. Sd/ Prabhjot Singh son of Sham Sunder, resident of Arya Samaj Road, Nawanshar, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar. Mobile No. 78147-13597”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner is an employee of a company, namely, Step to Success at Faridkot and the said concern is duly registered by the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot, under the provisions of Punjab Travels Professionals Regulation Act, 2014. Even, a certificate dated 03.05.2023 (Annexure P-1) has been issued to the petitioner by the competent authority. The petitioner is not associated in any manner with immigration or study visas and there was no privity of contract of the company of the petitioner either with the complainant or with Rimple, the alleged victim. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner and her company never received any amount either from the complainant or Rimple and thus, she could not be termed as a beneficiary in the entire transaction. In fact, the FIR is being used as practice tactic just to blackmail the petitioner and her custody will not serve any purpose.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner and her co-accused had taken a huge

amount from Rimple. Moreover, they had processed the file of Rimple and had annexed the forged and fabricated document. Due to this, not only the application of Rimple was rejected, but she had to face a 10 year ban and the concerned university also refused to refund the amount to her.

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

6. While rejecting the bail petition of the petitioner, the Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar, had recorded the following findings:-

“During the course of hearing, apart from complainant, the candidate Rimple also came present. The allegations against applicant-accused pertain to the fact that she induced the complainant Company to invest one year fee, one year insurance and funds of 14 lakh for candidate Rimple, with the undertaking that she, i.e. applicant-accused, would pay 18 lakh to the complainant Company, after receiving the visa of candidate Rimple. However, the case of candidate Rimple was spoiled by the applicant-accused by attaching forged documents, on account of which ten year ban has been imposed on the candidate and the fee deposited on her behalf by complainant, has been withheld by the concerned university on account of submission of fraudulent documents. The aggrieved candidate Rimple, during the course of hearing has submitted that her entire case was dealt with by applicant-accused Renu and that on account of 10 year ban imposed upon her, her entire

academic carrier has been compromised, thereby, causing acute trauma to her.”

7. I have carefully considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and also perused the record in the present case. From the record, it is evident that the present petitioner alongwith her co-accused had formed a gang, who were accepting application forms from the students for grant of study VISAS to them. In the present case, Rimple, a student/candidate applied for VISA and paid huge amount to the petitioner and her co-accused. However, the present petitioner and her co-accused had annexed the forged and fabricated documents alongwith her application form and did not fulfill the commitments. Due to this, not only the application form of Rimple was rejected, but she also faced a ban of 10 year and her academic career has been ruined. Moreover, even the concerned university had refused to return the fee to Rimple due to the said charge.

8. Thus, keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

9. Dismissed.

04.07.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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