



CRM-M-44580 of 2025

-1-

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

211

CRM-M-44580 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

Kamal Goswami

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Gaurav Antwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.181 dated 28.11.2024 registered under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Alewa, District Jind.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused allured innocent persons into investing their money in their company through an app and multiplying their money.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that even as per FIR, no direct allegations have been levelled against the petitioner except for a general statement of introducing the complainant to the company. He argued that the petitioner has no concern or connection with the company



concerned and in fact, he himself is a victim of fraud committed by the said company. He argued that no money was ever transferred in the account of the petitioner directly. He further argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any recovery and he is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind, vide order dated 29.07.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. The petitioner along with co-accused had cheated and defrauded the complainant and other victims to the tune of Rs.1,04,11,613/-. Even co-accused Kailash Malakar in his disclosure statement confessed the involvement of the present petitioner in the financial fraud. He further argued that the petitioner was given 14 notices to join the investigation but he never joined. He has further submitted that if the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail, there is apprehension that the petitioner might flee from the clutches of law as one of the co-accused Ravi Jain has already fled to Dubai. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair



CRM-M-44580 of 2025

-3-

and proper investigation in the matter as well as to find out the modus operandi of accused and to effect recovery of the money involved in the alleged fraud. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

*"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."*



7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

*"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".*

#### **Economic Offences**

*78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*

XXX XXX XXX

*83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the*

**CRM-M-44580 of 2025****-5-**

*respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.*

8. In the present case, as per the reply filed by the State, the present petitioner along with other co-accused had cheated and defrauded the complainant and other victims to the tune of Rs.1,04,11,613/-.

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

10. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

**11.09.2025**  
*D.Bansal*

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)**  
**JUDGE**

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