



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

108

CRM-M-33901-2025

Date of decision: 03.07.2025

Manish Tyagi @ Manish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Apurv Parashari, Advocate and
Mr. Didar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.201 dated 27.05.2025 under Sections 306/316(5)/318(4)/338/61 of BNS, 2023 read with Sections 43/65/66/76 of the Information Technology Act, 2008, registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, has drawn the attention of this Court to the contents of the FIR (Annexure P-1) and, *inter alia*, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that as per allegations levelled in the FIR, an amount of Rs.77 lakhs was embezzled by the petitioner; however, the petitioner had already tendered his resignation from the complainant company, M/s Prominent Comtech Pvt. Ltd. (PCPL) on 21.11.2024 and was no longer in a position to operate the bank accounts of the



CRM-M-33901-2025

company or handle financial transactions thereafter.

3. It is further contended that the present FIR is the third in a series of FIRs arising from the same transaction, and hence, is barred by the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***T.T. Anthony Vs. State of Kerala : 2001(3) RCR (Criminal) 436***, which prohibits the registration of multiple FIRs pertaining to the same incident. It is submitted that the investigation into similar allegations is already underway and, therefore, the registration of the present FIR is not only unjustified but also amounts to abuse of process of law.

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

5. At the outset, the reliance placed by learned counsel for the petitioner on ***T.T. Anthony's case (supra)*** is found to be wholly misplaced. A bare reading of the present FIR reflects that it discloses a distinct set of allegations, independent in nature, involving grave and specific accusations against the petitioner, including criminal breach of trust, theft of highly sensitive and classified information, forgery and conspiracy to misappropriate mission-critical intellectual property.

6. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner, while serving as General Manager at PCPL—a defence-orientated enterprise engaged in advanced R&D, design, and production of high technology amphibious land system platforms for the Indian Army—was entrusted with significant responsibility over the design, prototype, and financial management of a confidential defence project. The petitioner, in active collusion with Sachin Singh, a Mechanical Engineer of the company



CRM-M-33901-2025

and other co-accused, allegedly exploited his access to confidential project material, including prototype components, technical schematics, and proprietary designs.

7. It has further come to light during investigation that the petitioner, by procuring and using duplicate keys, unlawfully accessed a secured almirah containing sensitive documentation, and removed a data storage device containing critical and classified project information. The stolen data, according to the complainant, was intended for submission to the Indian Army and involved technology of significant strategic and national importance.

8. These acts *prima facie* would have not only caused substantial financial loss to the complainant party but also potentially compromised the integrity of defence-related intellectual property, thereby posing a serious threat to national security. The nature of the allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, and the evidence emerging during investigation, *prima facie* suggest a deliberate, well-planned, and systemic act of betrayal and misappropriation.

9. This Court, therefore, is of the considered view that the allegations against the petitioner are of an extremely serious nature and strike at the core of national interest. The theft and possible dissemination of mission-critical military-grade research and designs could have far-reaching consequences, including the compromise of national defence capabilities.

10. Given the sensitivity of the material involved, and the alleged role attributed to the petitioner in the unauthorised access and



CRM-M-33901-2025

theft of secured property, this Court has no hesitation that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not only warranted, but absolutely necessary to unearth the full extent of the conspiracy, identify other possible collaborators, and prevent further compromise of classified data.

11. Furthermore, the contention of the learned counsel that two FIRs containing identical allegations against the petitioner already stand registered against him, would not come to his rescue at this stage since both the previous FIRs were registered at the instance of different complainants.

12. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

13. 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.

03.07.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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