



219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-6703-2025

Date of decision: 01.04.2025

Rajbir @ Ghanshyam Verma and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Shakinderpal Singh Chakkal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Munish Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. This is the second petition filed by the petitioners praying for grant of anticipatory bail to them in case FIR No.43 dated 13.02.2021, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC and Sections 10 & 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.

2. As per the allegations made by complainant-Ajay, he and Suresh were running a Coaching Institute in the name of Uchana Mandi Saraswati Centre. Madam Tanisha @ Iti Singh (petitioner No.2) contacted them about a year ago. She told that the people who are interested in going abroad, they can arrange their Visa. She introduced them to Deepak Bhopachya who promised to take them to Chennai after 20 days on the advice of Tanisha @ Iti Singh. After this, she send them to Chennai along with Deepak Bhopachya and they were told that they were boarding the flight from there. It was found that Deepak Bhopachya fraudulently withdrew Rs.8,27,000/- from their account. They paid Rs.3,73,060/- in cash. Later on, it was found that Tanisha @ Iti send them a



fake Visa to go to Australia. They alleged that Tanisha @ Iti, Rajbir and Deepak Bhopachya together cheated them for an amount of Rs.16,20,000/- in the name of sending them abroad. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. Apprehending arrest, petitioners earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-30083-2021 and CRM-M-23215-2021 which were dismissed by this Court vide common order dated 29.09.2022. Thereafter, the petitioners had approached to the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Jind as well for grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, learned Sessions Judge, Jind declined the same vide order dated 23.01.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners primarily had submitted that the petitioners had settled the dispute amicably with complainant-Suresh Kumar. Learned counsel for the parties made a request for referring the matter to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for settling the dispute amicably. Thus, the matter was referred to the Mediation Centre vide order dated 05.03.2025. However, as per the report of the Mediator, the same remained unsuccessful.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has reiterated his arguments that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. However, the same has been opposed by learned counsel for the complainant and that of the learned State counsel.

5. Needless to say, this Court had already appreciated the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners and rejected this petition vide order dated 29.09.2022. It was on the request of learned



counsel for the parties, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but the same remained unsuccessful. Thus, this Court does not find any change in circumstance which had existed at the time when the earlier petition of the petitioners was dismissed by this Court.

6. This Court does not find any merit in the present petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

01.04.2025
m. sharma

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