

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51348-2024  
Reserved on: 13.01.2025  
Pronounced on: 30.01.2025

Parveen @ Daksh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA**

Present: Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate for the petitioner(s).  
Ms. Harpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Amit Bhardwaj, Advocate and  
Mr. Piyush Sardana, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA, J.**

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
347	21.09.2024	Butana, District Karnal	316(2), 318(4) of the BNS, 2023

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 18 of the bail petition, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

FIR No	Dated	Police Station	Sections
430	25.12.2021	Butana, District Karnal	279, 304-A IPC

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the FIR filed by the State, which reads as follows:

*"Sir, it is requested that I, Gulshan Kumar son of Shri Purushottam Das, am a permanent resident of village Anjanthali, Tehsil Nigdu, District Karnal. That about 3 months ago, I had a conversation with Ajmer Singh son of Shri Ratan Singh, resident of village Anjanthali, regarding sending me abroad and the said Ajmer Singh and his partner Daksh, resident of Purani Nilokhedi, talked about sending me to Canada in 3 months and had said that they would soon get me a Canadian visa; and at that time I got lured by them and gave them*

*my documents, my passport etc. It is that after this on 06/08/2024, the above two called me to their office Karsa Road Nilokhedi and showed me the Visa and asked me for Rs. 7,00,000/- and on 08/08/2024, I called them to my house and paid them Rs. 4,00,000/- in cash. After this, the next day I paid Rs. 2,11,000/- in cash at Tarawadi Mandi and paid Rs. 39,000/- through Google Pay. It is that after this, when I asked the above two to book a flight ticket, they told me to book the ticket from somewhere else. It is that when I asked them if there was any shortage in the visa, they told me that the visa is fine and if there is any shortage, then we are responsible for it. That thereafter, I booked a ticket for 10th August on my own will; and when we went to Delhi airport, the airport staff turned us away by saying that the documents attached with the visa are fake. That when I came back and confronted the above mentioned two people, they told me that we have got your work done and we will not give you your money, you do whatever you can; and when I confronted them they started threatening to kill me. Hence it is my humble request to you that please take strict legal action against the above mentioned two and got returned my money back and justice be delivered to me.”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply. Counsel for the complainant also opposes the bail.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

*10. That sum amounting to Rs. 4,00,000/- is to be recovered and custodial interrogation is required in this case.*

*However, it is further submitted that visa given by the present petitioner is to be verified/ ascertained as to whether the visa is original or not and from where it was made because the accused himself gets the visa on his mail on his laptop and for this purpose his custodial interrogation is also required in this case.*

*11. That the role/evidence of the present petitioner is as under:-*

*a) That the present petitioner along with his co-accused namely Ajmer*

*have committed fraud to an amount of Rs. 6,50,000/-.*

*b) That as per investigation the complainant was allured by the present petitioner and his co-accused and he has handed documents (passport) to them.*

*c) That as per investigation the present petitioner and his co-accused have prepared forged visa and the same was handed over to the complainant and the Immigration Authority did not allow the complainant for going to abroad the flight on the ground that documents attached with his application form for grant of visa were forged one.*

*d) That as per investigation/allegations on 06.08.2024, the present petitioner and his co-accused called the complainant in their office situated at Karsa Road, Nilokheri, and demanded Rs. 7 Lakhs. However, the complainant gave an amount of Rs. 4,00,000/- to them on 08.08.2024, while calling them to his house and next day he made payment of Rs. 2,11,000/- cash in Taraori Mandi, and Rs. 39,000/- through Google Pay.*

7. The sly way the petitioner conned the complainant points out the dangerous trend of the revival of thuggee by revisiting the history.

8. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

9. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

10. **Petition dismissed.** Interim order dated 04.11.2024 and subsequent orders are recalled with immediate effect. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

30.01.2025  
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.