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

1. CRM-M No.27530 of 2026

Meena Arora ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

2. CRM-M No.27554 of 2026

Adipt Arora ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	25.05.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	27.05.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	27.05.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Mandeep Baisala, Advocate,
Mr. Dhananjay Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Kavesh Bidhuri, Advocate and
Mr. Nitin Bhanwala, Advocate,
for the petitioners in both petitions.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Achin Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Karan Bansal, Advocate,
for the respondent-complainant.

***

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of the aforementioned two

petitions filed by the petitioners under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.96 dated 08.04.2026 registered under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Muktsar District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Manish Singla alleging therein that the petitioners in connivance with each other, had induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs.56,06,836/- on the premise of buying shares for him by investing of the aforementioned amount of money. He had not issued any valid receipt regarding investment of the said amount. His money was also not returned on asking. By alleging that the petitioners had cheated the complainant, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending their arrest, the petitioner Meena Arora and her son Adipt Arora i.e. the petitioner in the second petition moved a joint application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib vide order dated 04.05.2026.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. Infact, in the year 2023, one Amit Rabab who is residing in his neighbourhood, had requested the petitioner Adipt Arora to assist him in purchasing some shares due to the petitioner's expertise in the said field. Following successful initial investments, the said

Amit Rabab had told the petitioner Adipt Arora that several of his friends were interested in investing money in the share market. The complainant on asking of Amit Rabab had started investing in shares through the petitioner Adipt Arora. The petitioner Adipt Arora never met him and advise was given by him only through Whatsapp. The complainant even taking advice from the petitioner Adipt Arora chose to invest money at his own discretion and used to give frequent directions to the petitioner Adipt Arora to purchase shares of particular companies. He used to withdraw his funds both in cash as well as through bank transaction via the account of his friend Amit Rabab. Then abruptly, he demanded liquidation of all his shares. The petitioner Adipt Arora advised him that due to financial crisis, the share value had depreciated but he insisted payment of double amount of his original investment which led to a dispute between the parties. An oral settlement was then arrived at between them in October 2024 in pursuance of which, the petitioner Adipt Arora had transferred an amount of Rs.17.5 lakhs in the bank account of Amit Rabab for the benefit of the complainant and his associates whereas an amount of Rs.18 lakhs had been given in cash. The dispute between the parties is of civil nature which has been given a criminal colour. The investments made by the complainant in share markets were subject to risks and fluctuations but without considering this fact, the complainant has falsely involved his mother and himself in this case. The petitioner Adipt Arora is suffering from Erythromelalgia which is a rare and debilitating neurovascular disorder. His detention in custody would subject him to extreme physical agony and spontaneous bleeding from the legs and may lead to permanent tissue damage. He is ready to join investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. While arguing on behalf of the petitioner-Meena Arora, it is submitted by learned counsel that she is a home maker who had no concern with the investments made by the complainant. Some amount of money had been transferred in her account from the bank account of the complainant but such transaction does not make her a co-conspirator. There had been no inducement whatsoever on her part. The ingredients for commission of offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC are not at all attracted against her. She is ready to join investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. It is, therefore, urged that she deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and while relying upon the separate replies as filed by them has vehemently argued that the allegations against both the petitioners are serious in nature. Their complicity stands established in view of the fact that transaction of money from the bank account of the complainant has taken place in the account of the petitioner Meena Arora as well. For the purpose of conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of both the petitioners is must. It is, therefore, argued that the

petitions do not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner Adipt Arora is alleged to have induced the complainant to invest an amount of Rs.56,06,836/- in shares through him on the premise that he would invest money in the shares of different companies and for his profit. The petitioner Adipt Arora is, however, alleged to have not invested that money in any company thereby cheating the complainant. The petitioner Meena Arora, on the other hand, is alleged to have connived with the petitioner Adipt Arora who is her son. Admittedly, three transactions of different amounts of money from the bank account of the complainant are shown to have taken place in the bank account of the petitioner Meena Arora. As already discussed, she is mother of the petitioner Adipt Arora. Though the allegations against her are of hatching conspiracy, however, taking into consideration the nature of the allegations as levelled against her, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial that any conclusion as to the petitioner's Meena Arora hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused for cheating the complainant can be drawn and not at this stage. As such, her pre trial incarceration is not required. Accordingly, the petition i.e. **CRM-M No.27530 of 2026** filed by the petitioner Meena Arora is allowed and she is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to her surrendering before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of fifteen days from the date of passing of this order and joining

investigation. On her surrender within that period, she shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. She shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

9. However, so far as the petitioner-Adipt Arora is concerned, the allegations against him are not only of duping the complainant of a huge amount of money, however, it has also been reflected from the reply filed by the respondent-State that he had not invested the money received from the complainant in the shares of any company and had kept on representing to him that he had been doing so. Not only this, he is also alleged to have cropped the Whatsapp chats which had taken place between the complainant and the petitioner in past to his advantage. He claims return of some amount of money to Amit Rabab through whom the money had allegedly been invested by the complainant. However, no inference can be drawn at this stage that the money transferred in the bank account of Amit Rabab was meant for the complainant. There is no explanation as to why the said amount of money had not been given directly to the complainant. In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that for the purpose of conducting fair and proper investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner Adipt Arora is must. On account of his medical condition, no concession can be granted to him. More so, the powers of anticipatory bail are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional circumstances. In the present case, no

such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition i.e. **CRM-M No.27554 of 2026** does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

10. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

27.05.2026
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No