

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

2025:PHHC:078154



216

**CRM-M-27710-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 02.07.2025.**

Rajesh Dutt Sharma

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Yogesh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.55 dated 30.01.2025 under Section 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali.

The relevant facts of the present case are that the aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of the complaint filed by Hardev Singh, wherein it was stated that in the year 2017, he met with Ranjit Singh Sandhu and Rajesh Kumar and they told the complainant that Rajesh Kumar had formed a networking company in the name and style of Oorange Digital Marketing Pvt. Ltd.. He further told him that on investment of Rs.28,250/- they would be given one gold ring worth Rs.4,000/- in return and thereafter, amount of

Rs.1040/- would be given every week, for one year. As per the promise, complainant got three gold rings, which were given by Rajesh Kumar and complainant also started receiving Rs.3120/- every week. Thereafter, complainant further told his friends about this scheme and they also invested in the aforesaid company. Accused dishonestly induced the complainant to part with cash amount of Rs.86,250/- for three entries. Later on, complainant came to know that the aforesaid company had closed down and the accused had cheated the complainant and others of hefty amount of Rs.5,80,300/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was neither the owner, employee nor agent of the Oorange Digital Marketing Private Limited Company. The petitioner had not received any money from the complainant and other persons. He had been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence. The present case has been registered after an inordinate and unexplained delay of more than four years which raised serious doubts about the authenticity of the allegations. He submitted that the petitioner was ready and willing to join the investigation and this bail application be allowed.

Notice was issued in this case on 20.05.2025 and status report was called from the State, which has been filed today in the court and the same is taken on record.

Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application while contending that the petitioner along with co-accused Rohtash Sharma hatched criminal conspiracy and defrauded large number

of persons on the pretext of returning them gold jewellery and fixed amount every week and as such he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

As per the status report brought on record the petitioner along with co-accused firstly induced the complainant to opt for their scheme on the pretext of returning him double the amount against the investment made and thereafter, initially gave him three promised gold rings and cash amount of Rs.3120/- for few weeks and in this manner got made further investment through him from his friends. Subsequently, they closed their company operations and did not return the amount got invested and committed fraud of Rs.5,80,000/- with the complainant and other investors. There are specific allegations against the petitioner that he along with co-accused Rohtash Sharma duped innocent investors through a fraudulent investment scheme under the guise of a networking company, Oorange Digital Marketing Pvt. Ltd. The petitioner induced the complainant and others to invest substantial amounts by falsely promising high returns and material benefits and committed the deliberate and well planned act of cheating. There are also direct allegations against the petitioner that he used to come and collect money from the complainant.

So, keeping in view the seriousness of allegations and gravity of the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner, no ground is made out for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

02.07.2025.
Komal

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