

2026:PHHC:086744



105

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

**CRM-M-32943-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 05.06.2026**

DEVENDER SINGH RAUTELA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. SS. Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 (438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR NO. 0048 dated 04.02.2026 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B IPC 1860 (under section 318, 316, 351, and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), Police Station Tosham, District Bhiwani.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner was not a signatory authority of the alleged agreement nor the account related to the

petitioner in which the complainant has credited the amount. It is submitted that the petitioner was not the beneficiary of the transaction in any manner whatsoever. It has further been contended that the dispute, at best, arises out of the execution of an agreement wherein one of the parties allegedly failed to fulfil his part of the promise, therefore, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She on instructions from SI Pradeep Kumar, has submitted that the petitioner is also involved in six other FIRs pertaining to the functioning of the company, namely Kizansh Spirits Pvt. Ltd., in which the petitioner is stated to be a Director. It has further been asserted that out of the said six FIRs, four FIRs have been registered against the company and its Directors, including the present petitioner, whereas in the remaining two FIRs, the petitioner has independently been nominated as an accused on similar allegations made by different complainants. Learned State Counsel has further submitted that the operations of the accused company as well as its Directors are spread across various States including Rajasthan, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh. It is, however, admitted that the petitioner is already on bail in those FIRs.

3. **Analysis**

This Court is conscious of the settled legal proposition laid down in the case of CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “**Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab**” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein it has been held that the material forming part of evidence in other FIRs cannot by itself be a ground for denial of bail in another FIR, as each case has to be considered independently on its own merits.

This Court also finds that the complainant appears to have acted bona

fide, though induced by the prospect of profits, and had voluntarily invested the amount by crediting the same into the accounts of other persons. Admittedly, the alleged amount was not transferred into the account of the present petitioner in any manner. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be considered to be the direct beneficiary of the alleged transaction, if any, between the parties. Moreover, if multiple FIRs were already registered against the company and its Directors, the complainant was equally expected to exercise due caution and verify the antecedents and credentials of the company before investing such amount with the sole object of earning profits.

Hence, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of 10 days from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under subsection (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the

- case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of ten days, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

05.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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