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

**111-1** **CRM-M-51349-2024**

Rajpurohit Babusinh Harmatsinh @ Babu Singh

....Petitioner

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. Sapan Dhir, Advocate for the petitioner (through Video Conference).

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 petitioner 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. The gravamen of the FIR reflects that the complainant namely Gurpreet Singh, a property dealer of Urban Estate Phase-2, Jalandhar, was dishonestly induced by the accused persons, acting in criminal conspiracy, to part with huge sums of money on the false representation that accused Prashant Rokre was an IRS officer and Joint Commissioner, Customs, Delhi, having close links with the Finance Ministry and other government departments. It has been alleged that on the pretext of arranging a lucrative

business for the son of the complainant and investing in confidential government projects which would allegedly double or triple the invested amount within a short period, the accused gained the confidence of the complainant by showing forged identity cards, visiting cards and fabricated documents depicting abundant profits. Relying upon these false assurances, the complainant from time to time paid cash amounts and transferred several crores of rupees from his own as well as from his wife bank accounts to the bank accounts of accused Shrirang Parkhi and Babu Singh and also deposited money in a share trading account opened at the instance of the accused. It has been further alleged that the accused continued to make false promises of huge returns and avoided repayment on one pretext or another. When the complainant demanded the return of his money, the accused admitted that they have cheated him and threatened to implicate him in false cases by claiming influence with senior politicians and officials and extended threats to his life and property. In this manner, the accused persons, in furtherance of their common intention and criminal conspiracy, cheated the complainant by presented themselves as government officials, used forged documents, dishonestly induced delivery of property amounting to several crores, misappropriated the same and criminally intimidated the complainant when he sought recovery of his money. On these set of allegations, the FIR *ibid* has been registered and investigation ensued.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has *inter alia,* iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question as the same has been registered on the basis of a purely civil and commercial dispute which has been given a criminal colour. Learned counsel has further

iterated that the petitioner himself is a victim of the fraudulent acts allegedly committed by the co-accused Shrirang Chandrachud Ratnaparkhi and the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused solely on the basis of the purported disclosure statement made by the said co-accused which is inadmissible in evidence and carries no independent corroboration. Furthermore, the petitioner is neither a beneficiary of the alleged transaction nor any portion of the alleged amount ever been credited to or routed through his bank account. No documentary material has been produced by the prosecution to establish any financial nexus between the petitioner and the alleged offence. Learned counsel has emphasized that the petitioner has no knowledge of the alleged acts attributed to the co-accused. It has been further contended that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as he is ready and willing to join the investigation and to cooperate with the investigating agency as and when called upon. According to learned counsel, the petitioner undertakes to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court and shall cooperate with the investigation as well as during the course of trial.

4. *Per contra,* learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Balwinder Pal, has opposed the present petition and has argued that during the course of investigation, it has surfaced that out of the total amount of Rs.16 crore and 50 lacs received by the main accused namely Shrirang Chandrachud Ratnaparkhi, different amounts were transferred to various persons, including the present petitioner. Furthermore, it has come on record that the main accused has specifically disclosed that an amount of Rs.40.00 lacs (i.e. Rs.20.00 lacs on 21.11.2022 and Rs.20.00 lacs on

30.11.2022) were transferred into the bank account of the present petitioner which establish a direct financial link. On the strength of these submission,s the dismissal of the instant petition is prayed for.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has opposed the present petition by contending that the petitioner is 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 his bank account.

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

7. 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.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition in hand is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioner shall cause his appearance and cooperate with the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

**(SUMEET GOEL)**
**JUDGE**

February 24, 2026
*Ajay*

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