



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

106**CRM-M-39063 of 2025**

Date of decision: 23.07.2025

NARENDER MALIK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF U.T CHANDIGARH

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rahul Vohra, Advocate and
Ms. Benali Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T. Chandigarh
assisted by Kulwinder Kaur-SI.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.32
dated 18.04.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, 1860
registered at Police Station Cybercrime, Chandigarh.

2. The petitioner is stated to be running a call centre. The allegations
against the petitioner are that he is the kingpin in the racket of offering jobs to
innocent persons and then dupe them on the pretext of providing them with
jobs. The name of the petitioner although, is not named in the FIR, however has
come up in the disclosure statement of the co-accused who is stated to have
been working under the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he has been falsely
implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence as alleged in
the present FIR.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the grant



of bail on the ground that the petitioner has been evading arrest since the aforementioned FIR is registered and now non-bailable warrants have been issued against him and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present case. He further contends that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and thus, prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner. However, the petitioner has allegedly duped the complainant by inducing her to deposit money on assurance of providing job to her. Moreover, the petitioner is stated to have committed fraud with many persons and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

July 23, 2025
Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No