

2026:PHHC:085625



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

218

CRM M-15402-2026

Date of Decision:29.05.2026

Neekunj Gupta

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Pratik Ahuja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Matinder Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, with a prayer to grant her anticipatory bail in case in FIR No. 36 dated 07.03.2026, under Sections 318(4) and 316(2) of BNS, 2023 (Earlier Sections 406 and 420 of the IPC, 1860) registered at PS P.G.I.M.S, District Rohtak.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a young boy, aged 21 years, who had graduated from Bharati Vidyapeeth Institute of Management and Research, Delhi, and works as a freelancer by giving financial advice to individuals and small companies. He further contends that in fact, there was a dispute between the father of the petitioner and complainant. Even the entire business of M/s. Aarti Gems and Jewels is run by his father, Ashutosh Gupta, who is

the sole proprietor of the firm, and the petitioner had no concern with the said firm. In fact, he has been falsely involved in the present case, as unfortunately, he happens to be the son of the main accused. Learned counsel next contends that now the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties and a settlement deed dated 1st May 2026 has been arrived between the parties before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the parties have resolved all their disputes and he has no objection in case the petition is allowed by this Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. It is not in dispute that the matter pertains to a business transaction between the parties and it is also apparent from the record that now both the parties have signed a compromise deed dated 1st May 2026 before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Consequently, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

7. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section

482(2) of the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section482(2) of the BNSS.

29.05.2026			(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
amit rana			JUDGE
	Whether reasoned/speaking	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No