



CRM-M-12342 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

227

CRM-M-12342 of 2026  
Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

Arvind Narwal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Digvijay Dalal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, 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.129 dated 17.09.2025 registered under Sections 120-B, 370, 384, 420 IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station Bond Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused, cheated the complainant on the pretext of sending him abroad, abducted him and extorted a huge sum to release him. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged fraud. He further submits that there is not even an iota of evidence to



**CRM-M-12342 of 2026**      **-2-**

connect the petitioner with the alleged fraud. He further contends that there is an inordinate and unexplained delay in lodging the present FIR, as the alleged transactions started to take place in April 2024 and the complainant returned to India on 31.08.2025. Whereas, the FIR came to be registered on 17.09.2025. He submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents. He further submits that the co-accused Sandeep Kumar has already been granted the concession of bail by the co-ordinate of this Court vide order dated 19.01.2026. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency. Hence, he prays that present petition be allowed.

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 Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri, vide order dated 24.02.2026.

5.            On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and he is the main accused. He further argued that the petitioner is not on parity with co-accused Sandeep, as petitioner is direct beneficiary of the alleged fraud and extortion and has received ₹5.15 Lakhs directly into his bank account. He further submitted that the petitioner is not only peripheral participant but principal architect of the conspiracy. He along



with co-accused orchestrated a well planned conspiracy. He further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a fair and proper investigation in the matter as well as to unearth the modus operandi of accused; as well as to recover the amount involved in the alleged fraud and also to identify victims of similar fraud committed by the petitioner. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and pertain to a well-planned conspiracy involving fraud and extortion. As per the status report, the petitioner is not only specifically named in the FIR but is also alleged to be the main beneficiary, having received a substantial amount directly in his bank account. The material collected during investigation prima facie indicates the involvement of multiple persons acting in concert and the role of the present petitioner is yet to be fully unearthed. The investigation qua the petitioner is still underway and several aspects, including the flow of the cheated amount and the exact inter se role of the accused persons, are required to be thoroughly examined. The requirement of custodial interrogation, as asserted by the State, appears to be justified for effective investigation, recovery of the defrauded amount, and to unearth the complete modus operandi as well as involvement in similar offences. The petitioner also does not stand on parity with the co-accused who has been granted bail. The events in entirety indicate towards the existence of a bigger syndicate indulging in dubious activities as a result of which, innocent victims end up being preyed upon by such illusory tactics. While considering the plea for grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is required



to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

7. 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."*

8. Further, 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 enrope 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 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”.*

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.

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

**24.03.2026**

*Puneet....*

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