



CRM-M-17101-2025

-1-

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

211

CRM-M-17101-2025

Date of decision: 10th November, 2025

Chandrasekar Ruthrappa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Shailender Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through VC)
Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Yadav, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 64 dated 07.03.2025 registered under Sections 318(4) and 319(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Cyber South, District Gurugram.

2. The aforementioned FIR was lodged on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant-Anoop Singh, alleging that he was running a company under the name of Sky Tech Engineer India Private Limited, which was engaged in the business of civil construction. It was having head office at Gurugram and he used to take pan-India projects. He was having a contract of raising construction in Bangalore University and for that purpose, he needed steel TMT bars. He was looking for some supplier and while searching on Google, he came to know about one Shri Murugappa Steel



Hardware, who was in the nearby location of the site. He made a call on the given mobile number and the caller told him that they used to do business of sale of steel hardware in Erode, Tamil Nadu. The rates as given by the said person were reasonable and therefore, after making conversation on phone, the complainant gave order for purchase of 17 tons of steel TMT bars for a sum of Rs. 35,12,400/-. An amount of Rs. 17,02,752/- was transferred in the given bank account through RTGS. The material was to be supplied within two days. However, thereafter, the contact person did not respond and on checking, the complainant came to know that he had been duped of his money. As such, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. It has transpired that the amount of Rs. 17,02,752/- was transferred in the bank account of the petitioner. The petitioner has been nominated as an accused. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, which has been dismissed vide order dated 21.03.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, he had entered into business transaction with the company of the complainant for supplying of 120 tons of steel TMT bars on 30.01.2025. Purchase order was issued for 95 tons for TMT bars. An advance payment was received by him. He was to supply the material within four working days but due to unavoidable supply chain disruptions beyond his control, he could not supply the same and this fact was duly communicated to the complainant. However, instead of resolving the same, the complainant had lodged this complaint against him. Even his bank account has been frozen. He has been kept under extreme pressure and



coercion and has been forced to issue a Demand Draft of Rs. 4,00,000/- in favour of the complainant. Due to freezing of his bank account, severe financial hardship has been caused to him. He had no *malafide*. The transaction is purely commercial in nature. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. There is absence of any criminal intent on his part and as such, the ingredients for commission of subject offences have not been attracted qua him. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He is a habitual offender. With a criminal intent since the very beginning, he induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs. 17,02,752/- on the premise that he would supply steel TMT bars to him but did not supply the same. After transfer of money in his bank account, he withdrew a major chunk of the same and did not utilize it for finalizing the deal with the complainant and this showed his criminal intent. He is a convict in a case under Section 138 of NI Act and is involved in one more case of similar nature. No exceptional or extra ordinary circumstance for granting bail to the petitioner has been made out. It is, therefore, urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have duped the complainant for a sum of Rs. 17,02,752/- on the pretext of supplying steel TMT bars to him. He did not supply any material to him. The plea that the matter is civil in



nature as it is a case of commercial transaction cannot be accepted in view of the fact that the allegations *prima facie* show his dishonest intention since the very beginning in the transaction. There are specific allegations against the petitioner, who is a man of criminal antecedents. For conducting proper and thorough investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. In case his custodial interrogation is denied to the Investigating Agency, that will leave many glaring loopholes and gaps thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The matter has even been sent to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but the same could not be settled between the parties. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

10th November, 2025
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No