

2025:PHHC:009365



213

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

**CRM-M-55-2025  
DECIDED ON: 22.01.2025**

**MANBIR SINGH ALIAS MANVIR SINGH**

**....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Mr. Paras Talwar and  
Mr. Nikhil Thamman, Advocates  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG Punjab

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

**1. Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.126, dated 12.11.2024, under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Division No.7, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

**2. Brief facts of the case as per the version in the FIR read as under:-**

*“As per FIR, letter dated 02.08.2024 was received from complainant Eric C.Molitors, US Embassy, New Delhi, that Priya, Ranjit Singh and Kamal Chaudhary had applied for Student VISA through IBT Overseas Services Pvt. Ltd., Chhoti*

*Baradari -2, Jalandhar and during interview Embassy was suspicious about the documents submitted by them. Those documents were sent for verification and investigation. Priya, Kamal Choudhary and Ranjit Singh were joined in the Inquiry. Priya and Kamal Choudary had levelled allegations that current applicants had got prepared fake documents for them where documents of Ranjit Singh were found genuine. During inquiry, Priya and Kamal Choudhary stated that they had not got prepared their experience certificates and the same were prepared by applicants against 15,000/-. It had also come out in the inquiry that for showing funds in the accounts of Priya and Kamal Choudhary, applicants had got opened bank accounts and had charged {1,00,000/- each as interest from them. A case FIR no.73 dated 22.05.2024 under Sections 420, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, was also found registered with Police of Police Station Chanakyapuri, New Delhi against applicant Pardeep Singh and others.”*

3. **Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and no role has been assigned to them in relation to the documents in question, which were submitted by the student to the Embassy of the United States. Furthermore, the petitioner contends that it was not their duty to verify the veracity of the documents upon which the visa application of student was hinged.

**On behalf of the State/complainant**

Short reply filed by way of status report of Sirivennela, IPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Model Town, Jalandhar, is taken on record. In para 4 of the status report, the Officer is on record to say that the *modus operandi* of forgery by the applicants is yet to be unearthed, which would

require the custodial interrogation of the petitioner. As such, learned State counsel on the strength of the said assertion prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given a considerable thought to the submissions made hereinabove especially to the fact that admittedly the petitioner has already joined the inquiry and he is not involved in any other case, meaning thereby he is a person of clean antecedents, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

5. **Decision**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

*‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

*(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*

*(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*

*(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*

*(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.01.2025**

*Meenu*

*Whether speaking/reasoned*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable*              *Yes/No*