

139 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025.PHHC.173808



CRM-M-69710-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.12.2025

ANIL KUMAR

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present- Mr. Pawan Attri, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No. 602 dated 05.11.2024, under Sections 10 and 24 of Immigration Act and under Section 316(2) and 318(4) and Section 61 of BNS registered at Police Station Thanesar Sadar, District Kurukshetra.

2. Briefly, the allegations against the petitioner are that he had allegedly received an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs from the complainant on the pretext of sending him to Australia. However, neither the complainant was sent abroad nor the money was refunded to him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the wife of the petitioner has already been granted anticipatory bail passed by this Court vide order dated 02.12.2025 in CRM-M-67806-2025.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is

required for thorough investigation of the case.

6. Ms. Neelam Chaudhary, Advocate has filed power of attorney on behalf of the complainant. She has also opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the same grounds.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

8. A perusal of the order dated 02.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-67806-2025 shows that one of the grounds to grant anticipatory bail to the wife of the petitioner was that she was a household lady and has no concern with the commission of offence and the main allegations are against her husband i.e. the present petitioner. The petitioner is the main accused who has received the money. The FIR was registered since more than one year back. However, no effort has been made to arrest the petitioner.

9. Keeping in view the overall circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that the case requires thorough probe and investigation. As such, no exceptional or extra-ordinary circumstances are made out to extend pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

10. Dismissed.

10.12.2025

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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