



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

**CRM-M-12415-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 18.03.2026**

CHIRAG NARULA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Ms. Garima Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)

1. By way of the present first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 19 dated 09.02.2026, registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC), at Police Station Sadar Ambala, District Ambala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is innocent. It is submitted that the petitioner was merely working as a consultant on salary in the immigration office run by the co-accused, which is owned by Harpreet Singh, who is presently absconding, and the petitioner is neither a partner nor has any independent role in the said firm. It is further submitted that

although an amount of Rs. 98,500/- was credited to the account of the petitioner, the same has already been returned to the complainant. It is thus argued that the petitioner has no direct role in the alleged offence and is entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has file a status report today in Court, which is taken on record. He, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate, who has filed *Vakalatnama* today in Court, has opposed the present bail petition. It is submitted that the petitioner, along with co-accused Harbhajan Singh, entered into a criminal conspiracy and cheated the complainant of an amount of Rs. 14 lakhs on different dates on the pretext of sending her abroad, but neither sent her abroad nor returned the amount and instead provided her with a forged and fabricated visa. It is further submitted that the role of the present petitioner is that he actively associated with co-accused Harbhajan Singh in running the office of Sunfly Overseas Visa Immigration, Manav Chowk, Ambala City and participated in inducing the complainant to apply for a foreign visa. The petitioner was also a witness to the affidavit dated 01.05.2025 executed between the complainant and co-accused Harbhajan Singh and was present during the transactions. During investigation, it has also come on record that an amount of Rs. 98,500/- was transferred into the bank account of the petitioner by the complainant through online mode.

4. It is further submitted that the petitioner along with co-accused called the complainant to Chandigarh on 28.10.2025, where a fake Australian visa was shown to her and further payment was extracted. The petitioner actively participated in cheating the complainant and is directly

involved in the commission of offence. It is also submitted that one more FIR is registered against the petitioner.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court finds that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The role attributed to the petitioner shows that he was actively involved in the entire transaction and was not merely a passive employee. The status report further reveals the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, wherein it has been specifically stated that one more FIR of similar nature has been registered against him and that he is a habitual offender involved in cases pertaining to cheating, criminal breach of trust and extortion on the pretext of arranging fake visas for sending persons abroad.

6. In view of the gravity of allegations, the active role attributed to the petitioner and his criminal antecedents, this Court does not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case, which shall be adjudicated independently by the learned trial Court in accordance with law.

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

18.03.2026

Poonam Negi

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No