**204**

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

**-.-**

**CRM-M-11648-2026 (O&M)**
**Date of Decision : 20.03.2026**

Vikram Setia ....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and Another ....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present: Mr. Akshay Jindal, Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Amiya Malhotra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Shivam Joshi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

-.-

**MANDEEP PANNU J. (Oral)**

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 213 dated 04.09.2025, registered at Police Station Nigdhu, District Karnal, Haryana, under Sections 34, 406, 420 and 506 of the IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the complainant Amar Lal alleged that accused Komal Verma, who is his brother-in-law, along with the present petitioner Vikram Setia, induced him on the pretext of sending his son Paras Verma to the United States of America on study visa and work permit. The accused persons demanded a total amount of ₹40 lakhs and assured that they would arrange admission, visa and employment for the complainant’s son. Initially, an amount of ₹10 lakhs was taken in cash along with documents of Paras Verma, and subsequently further amounts were demanded and received, totalling about ₹37

lakhs. Thereafter, instead of sending the complainant's son to the United States legally, the accused persons allegedly routed him through various countries including the Netherlands, Suriname, Guyana, Brazil and other countries and attempted to send him illegally through jungle routes. It is further alleged that the accused persons kept demanding additional money and threatened the complainant. Ultimately, Paras Verma was apprehended at the American border, kept in a camp for several months and later deported to India.

3. On the basis of the said allegations, FIR No. 213 dated 04.09.2025 was registered at Police Station Nigdhu, District Karnal, under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 34 IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, and investigation was carried out wherein statements of witnesses were recorded and involvement of the petitioner was alleged in running an immigration agency and facilitating the said acts.

4. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the FIR is based on false and frivolous allegations. It is submitted that as per the contents of the FIR itself, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he is an acquaintance/friend of co-accused Komal Verma, who is the brother-in-law of the complainant, and no specific role has been attributed to him. It is further contended that the entire amount of ₹40 lakhs is alleged to have been paid to co-accused Komal Verma and the petitioner is neither a recipient nor a beneficiary of any such amount.

5. It is also submitted that there is an inordinate delay in lodging the FIR, as the payments were allegedly made in March and July 2024, and even as per the complainant's version, his son was deported in June 2025, whereas the FIR came to be registered only on 04.09.2025. It is further contended that the case of

the complainant revolves entirely around co-accused Komal Verma and except for being named, no overt act is attributed to the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel further submits that the custody of the petitioner is not required as the case is based on documentary evidence and nothing is to be recovered from him. It is also submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by the Court. Lastly, it is contended that the petitioner has not been declared a proclaimed offender and is not involved in any other case.

7. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is contended that during the course of investigation, it has come on record that the complainant had paid an amount of ₹37 lakhs to co-accused Komal Verma, who further transferred the same to Sahil, the cashier working with the present petitioner, which stands corroborated from the statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. It is further submitted that the petitioner is actively engaged in the business of sending persons abroad and his involvement in the present case has been duly established during investigation. The petitioner, in connivance with the co-accused, cheated the complainant on the pretext of sending his son abroad, but neither the said promise was fulfilled nor the amount was returned. It is further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy, identify other members of the syndicate and to effect recovery of the cheated amount. It is also contended that in case the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, there is every likelihood that he may hamper the investigation or abscond from the process of law.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered view that no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and pertain to cheating of a substantial amount on the pretext of sending the complainant's son abroad. The material collected during investigation prima facie indicates the involvement of the petitioner, particularly in view of the statement of Sahil and the role attributed to the petitioner in running the immigration business through which the alleged fraud has been committed. The requirement of custodial interrogation to unearth the entire modus operandi and recover the defrauded amount cannot be ruled out at this stage.

9. So far as the case of co-accused Ravi, who has been granted bail, is concerned, the same stands on a different footing. The role attributed to the said co-accused is limited and distinguishable, whereas the present petitioner appears to be a key person in the entire transaction, being directly connected with the handling of money and operation of the immigration business. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim parity with the said co-accused.

10. In view of the above, the present anticipatory bail petition is dismissed. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

March 20, 2026 **(MANDEEP PANNU)**
tripti **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking
Whether reportable : Yes/No