



103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33509-2026  
DECIDED ON: 11.06.2026

LOVEJEET SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Lakhwinder S. Sidhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

**1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) (equivalent of Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 31, dated 16.02.2026, registered at PS Sadhaura, District Yamuna Nagar, under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) (equivalent of Sections 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860) and Section 10 and 24 of Immigration Act.

**2 Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, a duly licensed immigration consultant, has been falsely implicated in the present case



CRM-M-33509-2026

with an intent to extort money from him. It is contended that all requisite travel documents, including visa, air tickets and hotel booking, were duly arranged and provided to the complainant's daughter in terms of the agreement executed between the parties, and that her departure could not materialize owing to her own disclosure before the Immigration Authorities that she was travelling on a Work Visa instead of the Tourist Visa arranged for her. It is further submitted the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

**On behalf of the State/complainant**

On the asking of Court, Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for dismissal of the present petition on the ground that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused duped the complainant for an amount of Rs. 4 lac approximately. He further argued that the petitioner is involved in other cases, therefore, being an habitual offender, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact that admittedly the petitioner is running a duly registered and licensed immigration consultancy firm and the State could not produce any incriminating material to connect the petitioner with the alleged fraud, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

As far as the contention of learned State counsel with regard to the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as ***“Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab”*** decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India,



this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial the concession of bail.

In the light of above, 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.

4. **Relief:-**

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 the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. 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**

**11.06.2026**

*Meenu*

*Whether speaking/reasoned* :Yes/No

*Whether reportable* :Yes/No