



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

106

CRM-M-48540-2025

Date of Decision : 01.09.2025

MANISH AGGI

.... PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... RESPONDENT

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present : Mr.Vikas Bali, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.85 dated 05.06.2024 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Division 5, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and his custodial interrogation is not required as nothing is to be recovered from him. The petitioner has clean antecedents and has deep roots in society. The similarly situated co-accused, namely Kanika Aggi has already been granted anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 03.02.2025 in CRM-M-32875-2024 (Annexure P-15). Hence, the present petitioner also seeks the concession of anticipatory bail on the ground of parity.
3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. Subhash Godara, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for investigation. If the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he may influence witnesses, tamper with evidence, and hamper the fair investigation of the case. Case of present petitioner is not on parity with co-accused (wife). The present petitioner has played a significant and major role.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the material available on record and in view of the fact that the present case falls under the category of economic offences affecting the socio-economic condition of country and the case of the petitioner is not on parity with co-accused as he has played a significant and major role in the commission of offence and the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to trace out true facts. Thus, he is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail as held by Supreme Court in “**State represented by the C.B.I. Thomas, JJ. Vs. Anil Sharma, Criminal Appeal No.811 of 1997 [Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.1127 of 1997], decided on 3.9.1997**” relevant whereof reads as under:

*“We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation orientated 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 suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations 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 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 would not conduct themselves as offenders.”*

7. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary in the given circumstances. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.
8. Apart from above, the petition of petitioner for same relief has already been dismissed on merit by this Court vide a detailed order dated 24.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-43453-2024.
9. The observations made herein are for disposal of the present petition and shall not be construed as opinion on the merits of the case.

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.09. 2025**

*anju*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No