



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

101

**CRM-M No.43484 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:25.02.2026**

Vikas Yadav

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Souravdeep Singh, ADVocate and
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Bhavya Vats, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, hereinafter being referred to as 'IPC' only, the FIR No.380 dated 24.07.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Karnal Civil Lines, District Karnal. In the above mentioned case, the petitioner is apprehending arrest, and therefore, for the benefit of anticipatory bail he has approached this Court, by virtue of present petition under Section 482 of 'Bharatiya Nagrik Surakhsa Sanhita 2023'.

2. In nut-shell the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Amit Kumar', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the above named complainant that 'Vikas Yadav' (petitioner herein) had induced him and his



family members to invest money in Steps Farming India (OPC) Pvt. Ltd. and that it was assured by the petitioner that his company was in the business of fertilizer and plantation. According to complainant acting upon the above mentioned false representation they invested money in the company of petitioner, and that the money was transferred through electronic mode either into the account of the company, or by Google Pay to the petitioner. It was further alleged by the complainant that the above mentioned money has not been usurped by the petitioner and this way the petitioner has been subjected to fraud for a sum of Rs.6,75,197/-.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that in fact, the petitioner himself is the victim of fraud and cheating. While claiming that the dispute between the petitioner and the complainants is with regard to payment of money only, it has been contended by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner that the remedy available to the complainant for redressal of his grievance lies in Civil Court, but by twisting the facts a dispute of civil nature has been given the colour of criminal case. While claiming that nothing is to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that his custodial interrogation will not serve any purpose, the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has requested the benefit of anticipatory



bail for the petitioner.

6. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above mentioned arguments. It has been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that the petitioner while making a false promise has duped the complainant and other investors, and that the intention of the petitioner right from the very beginning was to cheat the complainant, and thus, merely by saying that the dispute is of civil nature, the petitioner cannot be exonerated of his illegal acts.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. Those factors are:-

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the commission of offence is imprisonment up to 7 years;
- iii) that the recovery, if any, can be facilitated by issuing a direction to the petitioner to join investigation of this case;
- iv) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- v) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or



influence the prosecution witnesses; and

- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

10. In view of above-mentioned discussions, the present petition is hereby ***allowed*** and the petitioner is accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail. It is hereby directed that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. The petitioner will join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

05.02.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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