IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-33626-2026
Date of decision: 17.06.2026

ABHISHEK MARSKOLE ......Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

*****

Present: - Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kooner, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

*****

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0055 dated 23.12.2025, registered under Section(s) 316(2), 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 338 of the BNS added later on) and Section 66 (D) of the Information & Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Cyber Crime Police Station, District Patiala.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the complaint made by Jaswinder Kaur wife of Amar Singh Chahal. The complainant alleged that upon examining the documents and records maintained by her husband, Amar Singh Chahal, a retired Inspector General of Police, Punjab,

she came to know that he had become associated with an online investment group operating through WhatsApp and Telegram under the name "DBS Group". As per the complaint, the said group represented itself as a legitimate investment platform registered with the Government of India and SEBI and claimed to facilitate investments in IPOs, block trades, capital market stocks and over-the-counter (OTC) trades. The group was managed by a person identifying himself as "Dr. Rajat Verma", who projected himself as the Chief Executive Officer of DBS Group and by a woman identifying herself as "Meena Bhatt", who claimed to be an employee of the said organization. It was alleged that through messages circulated in the group, the members were induced to invest money on the assurance of substantial profits, while various participants in the group also shared purported details of profits earned from such investments. The complainant alleged that acting upon the representations made by the aforesaid persons and believing the investment scheme to be genuine, Amar Singh Chahal invested substantial amounts of money through various bank accounts maintained by him. It was alleged that, through multiple transactions conducted on different dates, an amount of approximately Rs.8 crores was transferred into bank accounts specified by the persons operating the group. According to the complaint, out of the aforesaid amount, nearly Rs.7 crores had been arranged by Amar Singh Chahal through borrowings from friends and acquaintances, while the remaining amount was invested from his personal savings. It was further alleged that after receiving the money, the persons operating the scheme provided fabricated investment records and portfolio statements issued by DBS Group and transmitted the same through WhatsApp and Telegram messages to create an impression that the investments were genuine and yielding profits. The complainant alleged that the said documents were false and had been prepared solely to induce continued investment and to conceal the fraudulent nature of the transactions. The complaint further stated that copies of the relevant bank account details, transaction records, group chats and personal communications exchanged with the persons running the investment scheme were produced before the investigating agency. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, it was asserted that unknown persons, acting in a pre-planned conspiracy, induced Amar Singh Chahal to invest approximately Rs.8 crores on the false promise of earning profits through investments in IPOs, block trades and the capital market and thereby dishonestly cheated him by obtaining the said amounts through fraudulent means. Consequently, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR has been registered after an unexplained delay of more than two months from the date on which the alleged transactions have come to the knowledge of the complainant. Learned counsel further submits that even if the allegations contained in the complaint are accepted at their face value, the material on record would show that the complainant had voluntarily invested money in the investment scheme and that the transactions in question were made by the complainant of his own accord. It is further argued that the petitioner was merely a peripheral participant and had no active or decisive role in the operation of the investment scheme. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was, at best, a bystander and has been unnecessarily implicated without any substantive material demonstrating his direct involvement in the alleged fraud.

4. Learned counsel also points out that the petitioner is suffering from Osteoporosis and is a severe patient of the said ailment. Owing to his medical condition, his mobility is stated to be substantially restricted and he requires continuous medical care and supervision. It is contended that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is in custody since 24.01.2026 and he has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 05 months. It is contended that the investigation in the case is complete and all the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate. Further, there are 28 witnesses out of which none has been examined, thus the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

5. Learned State Counsel contends that the petitioner had allured the complainant into making investments in his Firm and thereby cheated the complainant of approximately Rs. 8 crores. He, however, does not dispute there is no information about the petitioner being involved in any other criminal case and that the offences in question are triable by the Court of Magistrate.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the investigation having already been complete coupled with the stage of trial and bearing in mind that the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUNE 17, 2026 **JUDGE**
Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	**:**	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No