

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:163347



212

CRM-M-54948-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:21.11.2025

Rampal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vipul Dharmani, Advocate the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

...

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.676, dated 02.09.2025, registered under Sections 108, 3(5) of the BNS, at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of written complaint submitted by the complainant – Isha Sharma alleging that her husband Vijender Sharma was working as a Collection Manager in Kurukshetra Branch of Choramandalam Company. The present petitioner along with co-accused Sunil Vij and Ram Kumar Saini, who were also working in the same company had been mentally harassing her husband from quite some time. They used to get the salary of her husband, by getting

advance receipts drawn in the name of the customers and by securing blank cheques from those customers, in order to achieve their own targets and thereafter, they did not use to give back the money so taken. Due to this reason, her husband was unable to meet both ends due to having no money with him. They were facing a big financial crunch. The petitioner and above named person had also pressurized her husband to hypothecate his vehicle for the purpose of achieving their targets and they made him to do so and the entire money so received was also kept by them. They used to extend threats to get her husband terminated from his job. Her husband had moved an application for resigning from the service about two months back.

3. As per the further allegations, in the morning of 31.07.2025, three unknown persons had come to the house of the complainant and had taken him along with them. He came back in the night and was under stress. He told her that those persons had been extending threats to him. On 01.09.2025, her husband consumed Sulphas tablets and died during the course of treatment on 02.09.2025. By alleging that the suicide by her husband had been abetted by the petitioner and the co-accused, she prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated and the same are underway. The petitioner on apprehending his arrest, moved an application seeking grant of anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 12.09.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The deceased, whose job description was of Branch Receivable Manager/Team Leader, was used to collect

installments of loan from customers, including defaulters and was assigned the work of taking repossession of financed vehicles etc. Complaints had been received from the customers against him regarding misappropriation of amount of money entrusted to him for deposit of their loan accounts. Inquiries were conducted by the senior officials of the financial institutions, where they had been working, which substantiated the fact that the deceased after receiving substantial sums of money had not deposited the same. A customer had even served legal notice upon the finance company. There were allegations of possible embezzlement of company funds by the victim. The complaints and other matters were referred to Fraud Control Unit of the finance company. An inquiry was also initiated against him as per the rules and regulations of the company. It is further argued that the petitioner has been discharging his duty as a Branch Business Manager of the finance company and had no personal grudge or enmity with the deceased. After submission of resignation letter by the deceased, he had forwarded the same to the higher authorities for approval. No threat of any kind had ever been extended by him to the deceased. The allegations do not make out any case for abetment of suicide by the petitioner. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. The victim was harassed to such an extent by the petitioner and the co-accused, that he was left with no other alternate

step but to end his life. He had written a suicide note, wherein specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. For conducting deeper and thorough probe into the matter, his custodial interrogation is required. No exceptional or extraordinary circumstance for grant of bail is made out. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at a considerable length.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have abetted suicide by the victim. The victim had left behind a suicide note. Copy of the same has been placed on record. The allegations against him are serious in nature. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter and for eliciting information as to the modus operandi adopted by the petitioner and co-accused as well as the manner of committing the subject offences, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. Even otherwise, the petitioner has failed to make out any case for showing that there is any exceptional or extraordinary circumstance making out a case for grant of pre-arrest bail in his favour. It is well settled that anticipatory bail to an accused can be granted in exceptional circumstances only as a person couched in comparative safety of pre-arrest bail would certainly not disclose all the facts within his knowledge. In case custodial interrogation of the petitioner is denied to the Investigating Agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation.

8. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

10. It is, however, clarified that nothing stated above shall have any bearing on merits of the case.
11. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

21.11.2025
harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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