



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17160-2026
DECIDED ON: 30.03.2026

DEEPAK SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHERRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Sukesh Kumar Jindal, Advocate, and
Ms. Sonia Bohat, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Deepak Singh, aged about 32 years	52	13.02.2026	316(4) and 318(4) of BNS (sections 408 and 420 IPC)	Ambala Cantt.	Ambala

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that complainant-Harminder Singh Oberoi, who runs a showroom under the name and style of “Royal Enfield” in Ambala Cantt, has got an FIR registered against the petitioner-Deepak Singh, alleging therein that petitioner had been working with the complainant for approximately five years. Complainant claims that on 03.01.2026, a customer-Rohti Bansal,

paid an amount of Rs.3,162 to the petitioner on his phone number 85719-13416, for the purpose of insuring a motorcycle; however, the insurance was allegedly not processed.

On inquiry, petitioner purportedly disclosed that the amount was deposited in the bank account of his brother-Rahul, i.e., Axis Bank Account No.924010016071946. Upon examination of the bank account statements for six months, transactions totaling Rs.23 lakhs in account No.924010303608751 and Rs.36 lakhs in the preceding six-month period were observed, leading to registration of the FIR against the petitioner and his brother, alleging cheating.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner had joined the employment on 24.08.2024 and had resigned on 01.01.2026; therefore, he cannot be held responsible for any transaction dated 03.01.2026. It is further contended that FIR appears to have been lodged with a motivated intent and the allegations are, in substance, of a civil nature.

4. It is also submitted that petitioner is willing to cooperate fully with the investigation and join the proceedings, provided he is granted protection from arrest. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. Notice of motion.

6. On advance notice, Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Hitesh Malik, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent

No.2, and files his power of attorney in Court today, which is taken on record.

7. Learned State counsel submits that, during the course of investigation, it has been revealed that approximately Rs.62 lakhs were allegedly siphoned off over a period of one year, whereas petitioner was employed at a monthly salary of Rs.18,000/-.

8. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the complainant submits that, apart from the customer Rohit Bansal, no other customer has come forward to allege that the amounts deposited with the petitioner for the purpose of insurance of the motorcycle or preparation of RC, were misappropriated.

9. This Court has considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record available on file.

10. It appears that the allegations made against the petitioner would need to be established by the prosecution primarily through documentary evidence, such as the bank accounts of the motorcycle company/firm or the bank accounts of the petitioner, or by examining the private individuals, who purchased motorcycles and made payments to the petitioner.

11. It is already on record that, during the one-year period from 01.01.2025 to 31.12.2025, transactions totaling Rs.58,36,298/- took place in the petitioner's bank account. However, it would still need to be established, that the entire amount belonged to the complainant or to the

customers, who have not come forward with any allegations against the petitioner.

12. **Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition**, by directing the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

13. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

14. **With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.**

30.03.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>