



CRM-M-47077-2024

1

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

111-2

CRM-M-47077-2024

Anjali Chandrachud Ratnaparkhi and others

...Petitioners

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of decision: 24.02.2026**Date of Uploading : 25.02.2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Mahir Sood, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG Punjab.
Mr. Arihant Goyal, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioners seeking grant of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in FIR No.85 dated 07.08.2024 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Division No.7, District Jalandhar, Punjab.

2. On 16.10.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Status report dated 15.10.2024 filed in the form of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police/Model Town, Commissionerate Jalandhar, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia contends that neither the petitioners have any concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR nor they have concern with the complainant of the case. He reiterated that the petitioners being family members of Shrirang Chanderchur Ratna Parkhi have been implicated in this case without any reason. He submits



that no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioners and the only link to connect them with the transaction has been the alleged disclosure statement of main accused Shrirang Chanderchur Ratna Parkhi, wherein he has simply stated to have spent some amount on the family members i.e. the petitioners. He contends that this statement only does not qualify the petitioners to be imputed the criminal liability. He further submits that the petitioners are not having any other criminal case and are ready to join the investigation.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail petition by arguing that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required. However, to the query put regarding disclosure statement made by accused Shrirang Chanderchur Ratna Parkhi, learned State counsel on instructions from Senior Constable Jaswinder Singh has very fairly admitted that the said accused is alleged to have stated that he had spent some amount on his family members.

In view of the above circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, it is deemed appropriate that the petitioners should join the investigation first before deciding the petition on merits. Accordingly, the petitioners are hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and co-operate in the same. In the event of the arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on interim bail on their furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. They shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Balwinder Pal, has stated that pursuant to the aforesaid order(s), the petitioners have joined the investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has opposed the present petition by contending that the petitioners are an active participant in the fraudulent scheme and cannot claim to be an innocent inasmuch as substantial amounts of money forming part of the cheated sum were transferred to their bank account. Furthermore, in case the petitioners are

**CRM-M-47077-2024****3**

may abscond from the process of justice as also interfere with the investigation/witness.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

6. As per the allegations, the complainant, who is engaged in the business of sale and purchase of property, was desirous of setting up a separate business venture for his son. It has been alleged that co-accused Tilak Raj, an acquaintance of the complainant, introduced him to co-accused Prashant Rokre, an IRS Officer and purportedly having connections in the Ministry of Finance. Furthermore, the complainant was induced to invest large sums of money on the assurance that the investment would yield substantial return. It has been further emerged from the record that the money was alleged to have been transferred into the account of accused Shri Rang Chandrachud Ratna Parkhi. During the course of investigation, co-accused Tilak Raj was arrested on 10.08.2024 and co-accused Shri Rang Chandrachud Ratna Parkhi was arrested on 13.08.2024. During interrogation, both the accused disclosed the alleged *modus operandi* of the offence. Learned counsel, during the course of hearing, have apprised this Court that the said accused i.e. Tilak Raj and Shri Rang Chandrachud Ratna Parkhi have been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. At this stage, this Court refrains from making any observation on the merits of the allegations. The matter is still under investigation and the evidentiary value of the disclosures made by the aforesaid co-accused is to be examined during the course of trial on the basis of material collected by the investigating agency.



7. Keeping in view the factual *milieu* of the case in hand and upon perusal of the record; especially in lieu of the allegation made; the petitioners having joined the investigation and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not sought for by the State, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 16.10.2024.
8. In view of the above, the interim order dated 16.10.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.
9. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
10. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
11. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026
Ajay

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