



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

203

**CRM-M-58692-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.05.2025**

Vikramjeet Singh @ Bikramjeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhishek Arora, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Vikramjeet Singh @ Bikramjeet Singh, in FIR No.67 dated 22.03.2024, registered under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC at Police Station Farakpur, District Yamunanagar.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant Sudhir Kumar (respondent No.2) alleged that he and others were cheated by the accused persons, who had set up a firm under the name and style of "AGR Business Zone India Pvt. Ltd." The petitioner along with his co-accused allegedly induced the complainant to invest money in the firm with the promise of doubling their investment in a short time. On the said assurance, the complainant invested Rs.3,59,700/- and upon his



recommendation, his friends and relatives also invested a total amount of Rs.9,26,500/-. The money was transferred into various bank accounts, including one in the name of Jasvinder Kaur. Soon thereafter, the firm was shut down and the complainant was told to invest his money in a new firm, however, when the complainant demanded his money back, he was allegedly threatened with dire consequences. Based on these allegations, the FIR (supra) was registered under Sections 406 and 420 IPC.

3. The petitioner was granted the concession of ad interim anticipatory bail on 25.11.2024 with the direction to deposit a sum of Rs.5.00 lakhs in the shape of FDR in favour of the Registrar General of this Court. Initially, he arranged only Rs.2.00 lakhs and kept seeking adjournments. Eventually, he brought a demand draft of Rs.3.5 lakhs on 02.04.2025. Thereafter, on joint request made by learned counsel for the parties, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. However, the petitioner failed to appear before the Mediation Centre on the scheduled date, reflecting a lack of seriousness and cooperation.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of the allegations and the conduct of the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has not complied with the conditions laid down by this Court in the order dated 25.11.2024. The purpose of granting interim protection was to allow the petitioner to demonstrate



his good faith and willingness to cooperate and not to delay the proceedings or disregard the Court directions. The absence of the petitioner from the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, despite clear orders, shows his non-cooperative approach.

5. Further anticipatory bail is an equitable relief and must be granted only to those who approach the Court with clean hands. In the present case, the petitioner's conduct does not warrant the exercise of such discretion. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

21.05.2025

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No