



CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 05.02.2026

Seema Begum

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Pratap Singh, Advocate and  
Mr. Manav Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jitender Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

Ms. Manvi Arora, Advocate, for  
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate  
for private respondents-Joni Rana and Gagan Miglani.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

**CRM-47692-2025**

This is an application for impleading the applicants as respondents in the present case, who are the victims in the present case.

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

**Main Case**

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.254 dated 04.07.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471

**CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -2-**

and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Nissing, District Karnal.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused under the name of Pride Nidhi Limited Bank duped the complainant and others for a sum of Rs.1.40 crores on the pretext of doubling their money in 26 months. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that earlier also, the complainant had filed the similar complaint against the petitioner and others and after investigation of the matter, the same was found to be false. Thereafter, the present FIR was registered because of political pressure. He further argued that Pride Nidhi Limited Bank (PNL) is a duly registered company. He further submits that the FIR was lodged with ulterior motive as the complainants were earlier employed with the bank and now they are defaming and harassing the petitioner. He further argued that the petitioner has neither committed any embezzlement nor misappropriated any funds. He further submitted that entire family of petitioner has been implicated in the FIR, although, they have nothing to do with the alleged offence. He further submits that in fact, the dispute in the present case is of civil nature, which has been given criminal colour by registering the present FIR. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner had moved an

**CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -3-**

application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, vide order dated 30.09.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR. She further argued that the petitioner along with other co-accused induced the complainant/investors to invest their money in their bank by giving false promises to double their money in 26 months. He further argued that the said bank is operated by the petitioner as well as co-accused Rais Khan and they have duped the complainant/others for huge amount of Rs.1.40 crores and as such, are the main perpetrators of the crime. Further, a perusal of bank accounts reveal tht whole fraud involves a total amount of Rs.58-60 crores. She further submits that investors were inducted to deposit money into bank account of the petitioner under PRD Scheme. She further argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a fair and proper investigation in the matter as well as to unearth the modus operandi of accused and to recover the amount involved and to trace similarly placed victims. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession



**CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M)     -4-**

of bail.

7.            Learned counsel for the private respondents opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner contends that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

8.            Heard.

9.            In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. She is specifically named in the FIR. She is alleged to have cheated the complainant and other innocent people for huge amount of Rs.1.40 crores by inducing them to invest their money into his bank. As per the status report, the entire fraud is estimated to be around 58-60 crores and thus, her custodial interrogation is required to uncover the modus operandi and to recover the amount involved in the crime. The events in entirety indicate towards the existence of a bigger syndicate indulging in criminal activities. While considering plea for grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.



CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -5-

10. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

*"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."*

11. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while



CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -6-

dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

*"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".*

***Economic Offences***

*78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*

XXX XXX XXX

*83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the*



**CRM-M-58850 of 2025 (O&M) -7-**

*effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.*

12. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

13. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**05.02.2026**  
*D.Bansal*

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