



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

102

CRM-M-32491-2025

Date of decision: July 2nd, 2025

Arjun Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

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

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.139 dated 08.04.2023 under Sections 420, 406, 506 and 34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Hisar Civil Lines, District Hisar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner was introduced to the complainant by the co-accused, Dinesh Sharma, and has not received any money from the complainant- neither in cash nor through any banking transaction. It is further submitted that, as per the investigation conducted so far, the alleged amount has been traced to the bank account of one Priyanka, who is projected as a victim in the present FIR and not a beneficiary. Learned counsel has further emphasized upon the clean antecedents of the petitioner and asserted that in the circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be warranted.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rahul Mohan, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

5. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by contending that there are specific, grave and well substantiated allegations against the petitioner regarding his role in duping the complainant of a sum of ₹1 lakh on the pretext of arranging a Government job. It is pointed out, on instructions, that the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused, orchestrated the fraud and misled the complainant. Further, during the course of investigation, it has come to light that the petitioner is allegedly involved in defrauding approximately seven other individuals using the same *modus operandi*, causing a cumulative loss of around ₹9 lakh.

6. Learned State counsel, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is the key person behind the opening and operation of a bank account in the name of Priyanka-who appears to have been misled by the petitioner, and that the ill-gotten money was subsequently withdrawn by the petitioner himself. Additionally, it has been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner is also named as an accused in two other FIRs involving similar allegations of cheating.

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

8. On a *prima facie* evaluation of the facts and circumstances and the allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1), it is evident that serious and specific allegations of cheating have been levelled against the petitioner. The material placed on record suggests that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, systematically defrauded multiple individuals under the false assurance of providing them with

employment. The financial transactions linked to the petitioner, coupled with the registration of two other FIRs against the petitioner involving identical allegations, clearly point to the petitioner being a habitual offender.

9. The nature and gravity of the allegations, and the *modus operandi* adopted by the petitioner are not isolated or speculative rather they disclose a larger conspiracy involving public deception for unlawful gain. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner would, therefore, be necessary to uncover the full scope of the fraud and identify other victims or accomplices involved.

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

11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

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.

July 2nd, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No