



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

Sr.No.220

**CRM-M-15709-2026
Decided on : 07.04.2026**

Richhpal Dabla

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Raj Mohan Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.180 dated 18.12.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023, at Police Station Baund Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner cheated the unemployed youths by luring them with false promises of employment in the Army and collected money from them. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner has not committed any offence and he has no



concern with the said offence. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has not received any amount in cash or in his bank account, therefore, it cannot be said that he is involved in the said crime and the allegations levelled against him are concocted and baseless. He further contends that the petitioner has been implicated in the said FIR only to exert political pressure. It has been contended that there is an unexplained delay of 02 years in lodging the FIR which clearly shows that the version of the complainant is totally false. He contends that the transactions were made from the account of co-accused, therefore, interrogation of the petitioner is not required. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency. Therefore, it is urged that the instant petition be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter which is taken on record. She while referring to the same, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She contends that the petitioner has obtained money from the complainant and other victims with fraudulent means in lieu of arranging their recruitment in TA and Railways, and the connection of the petitioner is directly established from the fact that Rs.90,000/- has been received on-line by the petitioner from the victim and Rs.10,26,300/- has been transferred to other accounts.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the petition for anticipatory bail, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Heard.



7. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution, the petitioner is running a racket to deceive various persons including the youth on the pretext of providing employment in the Army.

8. 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."

9. 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 enroled 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”.

10. 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 hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

07.04.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No