



CRM-M-10011 of 2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CRM-M-10011 of 2026

Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

Dr. Sukhdev Singh @ Sukhdev Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.67 dated 16.04.2025 registered under Sections 61(2), 351(2)(3), 351(2), 318(4), 316(2), 249, 336(3), 338 and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4, 5, 6 of PCMCS Act, Section 3(2) of HPIDFE Act and Section 21(2) of BUDS Act, at Police Station Sadar Ratia, District Fatehabad.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused had cheated the complainant for a sum of Rs.3 lakhs, under the pretext of doubling the money and threatened him when he asked for his money. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted

**CRM-M-10011 of 2026****-2-**

that the petitioner is running a company in the name and style of 'Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Services Private Limited' and he has been arrayed as an accused primarily because of his association with the said company. He argued that during the investigation, the petitioner has already returned more than Rs.7.5 Crores to various persons, which fact is not disputed by the prosecution and the same demonstrates the bona fide conduct and intention of the petitioner. He submitted that the petitioner is ready to return the amount to remaining persons with whom he had entered into valid agreements. He further submitted that the entire case is based on documentary evidence which are already in possession of the complainant or the investigating agency, hence, nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 08.05.2025. The investigation in the case is complete and challan also stands presented. He further submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are already on record and while referring to the status report, she has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner along with his co-accused, registered a company in the name of his father 'Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Services Private Limited and the petitioner owns 98% share capital of the company. She argued that through this company, without obtaining any valid license from the concerned authority, without a GST

**CRM-M-10011 of 2026****-3-**

number, and without any certified documents related to monetary transactions from the Reserve Bank of India or any other competent agency, they carried out business activities in violation of company regulations. By giving the general public a special agreement bearing their signatures, they falsely assured and motivated people that the money they invested would double in one month and become six times in three months. By making such false promises and inducements, they collected investments from people. As per the documents and evidence submitted by the victims, the petitioner illegally collected around Rs.25 crore and failed to return the invested money within the agreed period as per the agreements given to the victims, thereby cheating them of crores of rupees. From this cheated amount, the petitioner has acquired luxurious houses and other movable and immovable properties. New victims and investors are continuously being identified and induced in the ongoing investigation. During the investigation, it has also come to light that from the cheated amount, the accused had not paid GST and Income Tax to the government, thereby causing a revenue loss of several crores of rupees. Hence, she prays that the present petition be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature, which pertains to a well-planned economic offence involving the cheating of numerous investors to the tune of crores of rupees. The material on record prima facie indicates that the petitioner, in connivance with co-accused, induced the general public to invest money on the false assurance of exorbitant returns, without any lawful authority or regulatory compliance. The magnitude of the alleged fraud, the



CRM-M-10011 of 2026

-4-

manner in which it was executed, and the fact that new victims continue to surface, reflect the serious nature and wider societal impact of the offence. Mere partial repayment of the defrauded amount does not absolve the petitioner of criminal liability at this stage. Considering the possibility of influencing witnesses, the likelihood of further unearthing of financial irregularities, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds no ground to exercise discretion in favour of the petitioner. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra*, (2007) 1 SCC 242 and *State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi*, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC).

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, coupled with the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Accordingly, the present petition being bereft of any merit, is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
D.Bansal

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