



CRM-M-49416-2025 (O&M) & one connected case

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 12.03.2026

102. CRM-M-49416-2025 (O&M)

Minku Gupta @ Mahesh Gupta

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab & anr.

...Respondent(s)

103. CRM-M-67311-2025 (O&M)

Vasudev Gupta

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab & anr.

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Savi Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mansur Ali, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Tushaar Madaan, Advocate
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-53058-2025 in
CRM-M-49416-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Reply filed on behalf of respondent No.2 is taken on record.

Main case

1. Above-mentioned two petitions are being disposed of by passing a common order as the petitioner(s), who are son and father respectively in both the cases are seeking anticipatory bail in case arising out



of FIR No.135 dated 12.06.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station City-I, Abohar.

2. Vide order dated 04.09.2025, arrest of the petitioner-Minku Gupta @ Mahesh Gupta was stayed and vide order dated 01.12.2025, petitioner-Vasudev Gupta was granted interim bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) *inter alia* contends that pursuant to the orders dated 04.09.2025 and 01.12.2025 respectively passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioners in both the cases have joined investigation and are no longer required for investigation of the case. She further contends that the gist of the allegations levelled by the complainants (57 in number) are to the effect that M/s AMM GEE Traders, M/s Manak Chand Gobind Ram Commission agents situated in Abohar and under the proprietorship of JP Mittal and Sunil Mittal HUF respectively had allured the complainant/victims to invest in mustard for good returns. Acting on the assurance, they handed over the money to the above-said firms for purchase of mustard. However, the amount was not returned and even the purchased mustard crop was sold by the HUF/proprietorship without permission of the complainant/victims. The victims have thus been duped of their hard earned money by alluring them on false pretext of hefty margins and profits.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the petitioners in both the cases were employed as Munim and that as per the status report, allegations against the petitioner(s) are only to the effect that procurement of mustard by the respective firms had been done through them. Counsel contends that the petitioner(s) were neither the owner nor



partner in any of the said firms and attribution of inducement, receipt of money and sale of purchased crop, if any, would be primarily against Jai Parkash Mittal proprietor of the M/s AMM GEE Traders and Sunil Mittal HUF of M/s Manak Chand Gobind Ram.

3. Learned Sr. counsel appearing for respondent No.2 vehemently contends that large number of persons have been duped by the said firms. Mustard crop was purchased from their monies and the same was sold without their consent and the proceeds were embezzled/misappropriated by the proprietors of the said two firms.

4. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner(s) were neither the proprietor nor partner in the said firm. It is also admitted position that the petitioners are not recipients of the benefit and had also not allured the respondent-complainant to invest for purchase of mustard.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions, does not dispute the said averment and submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner(s) is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since the petitioners have already joined the investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required, both these petitions viz **CRM-M-67311-2025** and **CRM-M-49416-2025** are **allowed** and the respective interim orders are made absolute.

7. It is, however, made clear that the said petitioner(s) shall continue to join investigation and extend all cooperation to the Investigating Agency, as and when required. In the event of the said petitioner not extending due cooperation, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an



application for seeking cancellation of the bail granted by this Court. They shall continue to abide by terms of Section 482(2) BNSS.

12.03.2026
monika

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

: Yes/No

: Yes/No

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE