



CRM-M-54969 of 2025

-1-

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

108

CRM-M-54969 of 2025
Date of Decision: 30.09.2025

Vikram Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Abhay Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Sheoran, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.306 dated 11.09.2025 registered under Sections 316(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station Butana, District Karnal.
2. Brief facts as per the case of the prosecution are that the petitioner along with co-accused cheated the complainant-Sunil Kumar for a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- on the pretext of sending him abroad and securing high paying job with a salary of Rs. 90,000/- per month.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that neither the petitioner received any amount in his account nor has committed

**CRM-M-54969 of 2025****-2-**

any such offence. He argued that the alleged payment was made on 27.07.2025 and the FIR in question was registered on 11.09.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of more than one month, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that in fact, it is the co-accused Gurjot Singh, who had entered into compromise with the complainant to repay the amount taken by him and in this regard, the said Gurjot Singh had given two cheques of bank account of his brother Shehbaj to the complainant. It has also been contended that those cheques had bounced later on and thereafter, the present FIR has been lodged by the complainant-Sunil as a counter-blast. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, vide order dated 20.09.2025.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that it was the petitioner-Vikram with whom the deal was struck to send the complainant to Russia for Rs.3,50,000/- and securing high paying job. He further argued that it was the petitioner who introduced the complainant with co-accused Gurjot after taking the whole amount in cash



CRM-M-54969 of 2025

-3-

from the complainant on 27.07.2025. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and clear role has been attributed to him. The money is yet to be recovered. The *modus operandi* adopted by the petitioner will be unearthed only upon effective investigation for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the

**CRM-M-54969 of 2025****-4-**

custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

30.09.2025*D.Bansal*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No