



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

108

CRM-M-14357-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 17.03.2026

Ashok Kumar		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. R.P. Dhir, Advocate for the petitioner.
(Through Video Conferencing)

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (438 of Cr.P.C.), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.364 dated 11.11.2025, registered under Section 318(4) of BNS and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Act, 2014, at Police Station City Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner's son and daughter-in-law had a matrimonial litigation and the daughter-in-law, in conspiracy with the complainant, has implicated the petitioner in the present FIR. It is further submitted that there being no prima facie case having been made out against the petitioner, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State. Mr. Kamaljeet S. Mamrat, Advocate has put in appearance

*CRM-M-14357-2026 (O&M)*

(2)

on behalf of the complainant and has filed power of attorney, which is taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who along with co-accused duped the complainant of a heavy amount of Rs.7 Lakhs on the pretext of sending him abroad. Complainant was also provided with a visa which was found to be a fake one. Thereafter, neither he was provided a valid visa nor the money paid was returned to the complainant. Moreover, even the petitioner's licence has been cancelled by order of District Magistrate, dated 15.02.2023. It is further submitted that the petitioner was involved in multiple cases, and his anticipatory bail in another FIR of similar nature has already been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 21.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-38388-2025. Thus, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition as custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of the duped amount, and elicit details regarding modus operandi of the accused persons.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, and the fact that the petitioner along with co-accused was alleged to have taken Rs.7 Lakhs from the complainant on the pretext of sending him abroad; the petitioner is also alleged to have provided the complainant with a fake visa; thereafter neither complainant was provided a valid visa nor the money paid by him was returned; the petitioner is involved in 06 other FIRs, hence, in view of the foregoing discussion, custodial interrogation of the



CRM-M-14357-2026 (O&M) (3)

petitioner is necessary for a proper investigation and collection of evidence. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as ‘**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997**, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands **dismissed**.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

17.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No