

2025:PHHC:059780



218.

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

**CRM-M-20529-2025**

Date of decision: 06.05.2025

Jassi .... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana .... Respondent

218/2.

**CRM-M-20530-2025**

Harsh Maggo .... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana .... Respondent

218/4.

**CRM-M-20531-2025**

Gurbaksh Singh .... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana .... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Sumit S. Bairagi, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate, for the complainant.

-----

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners, in the present petitions, are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 read with Section 528 of BNSS, in case FIR No.407, dated 05.07.2024, under

Sections 34, 417, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471, 506, 467 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 10-A, Gurugram.

2. Since these petitions have arisen out of the same FIR, they are being taken up together for disposal by this common order.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR (Annexure P-1), which pertains to allegations of extorting money from the complainant under the guise of securing government employment. It is contended that the petitioners are being made scapegoats at the instance of the complainant and the Investigating Officer, and that no recoveries are to be effected from them. Learned counsel further asserts that the dispute stems from personal animosity between the complainant, the police officials and the prime accused, Manpreet Kaur, and that the petitioners are collateral casualties of the said discord.

4. Learned counsel has drawn attention to the fact that co-accused, Manpreet Kaur, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by learned JMIC, Gurugram, vide order dated 16.08.2024 (Annexure P-3), and that alleged settlement has been reached between the complainant and the said co-accused.

5. Learned State counsel, assisted by the counsel for the complainant, have vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. While referring to the contents of the FIR (Annexure P-1), it is submitted that the petitioners played an active and direct role in duping the complainant of a substantial sum of money,

running into several lakhs of rupees, on the pretext of arranging government jobs. It is further alleged that the petitioners issued forged appointment letters and even conducted a fabricated medical examination to lend credibility to the fraud played upon them.

6. It has also been categorically denied that any compromise has been effected between the complainant and co-accused, Manpreet Kaur, as claimed by the petitioners. Still further, it has been submitted, on instructions, by the learned State counsel that documentary evidence exists showing financial transactions from the complainant to the bank accounts of the petitioners, indicating their direct involvement. Moreover, it is highlighted that the petitioners, along with co-accused, Manpreet Kaur, are allegedly operating a large scale racket involving similar fraudulent activities, with as many as 16 other complaints having been received against them across the National Capital Region (NCR).

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

8. The allegations against the petitioners are prime facie of a grave and serious nature. Further, there is prime facie evidence suggesting that the petitioners, in active connivance with co-accused persons, were part of a well organized and systematic racket that deceived innocent persons under the false pretext of providing government jobs, leading to fraudulent gains amounting to approximately Rs.40 lakhs. The alleged modus operandi involved not only the issuance of forged documents but also orchestrated medical examinations to mislead the victims and earn their trust.

9. Furthermore, the existence of multiple complaints against the petitioners in similar circumstances reflects a pattern of repeated and deliberate criminal conduct, which cannot be ignored. Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is, therefore, warranted to unearth the full extent of the fraudulent operations of the racket and trace the proceeds of the crime.

10. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

11. Present petitions stand dismissed accordingly.

12. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 06, 2025**

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No