



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

106

DATE OF DECISION: 27.01.2026

1. CRM-M-70667-2025 (O&M)

PRASHANT SHARMA		Petitioner
	VERSUS	
STATE OF HARYANA		Respondent

2. CRM-M-70695-2025 (O&M)

PREM CHETAN SHARMA		Petitioner
	VERSUS	
STATE OF HARYANA		Respondent

CORAM HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Rohit Aggarwal, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of common order, the aforesaid petitions shall be disposed of, which have been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.131 dated 01.07.2025 under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-18, District Gurugram.
2. The allegations against the present petitioners are that petitioners stood as Directors of the Company which is alleged to have

disposed the complainant-Company while allegedly making the complainant-



company pay money to the tune of approx. Rs.3,59,58,127 to three vendor firms namely Affinity Apparels, Oshia International and BTC Retail which are subsidiaries of the petitioners' Company as Directors of the accused-company and the office bearers of three vendor firms were the same as of the accused Company; further, no goods were ever supplied to the petitioners' Company. Hence, accused Company at behest of its Directors i.e. the present petitioner(s) is alleged to be involved in money laundering.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR and the aforesaid FIR is abuse of process of law instituted by the complainant with ulterior motive to extort money from the petitioners; the allegations contained in the FIR do not constitute any criminal liability upon the petitioners and the entire version put forward is nothing beyond civil liability. It is further contended that prayer made in the aforesaid FIR is for recovery of amount which was in fact due from the complainant-Company towards the accused-Company i.e. M/s. Citi Mega Mart Pvt. Ltd and the petitioner(s)-Prashant Sharma and Prem Chetan Sharma resigned on 31.12.2024 as Director of the said Company and the liability qua complainant-Company was accepted by other co-Directors of the Company.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submits that the money was routed through the account of the Company in which petitioners stood



as Directors, and forged & fictitious bills were generated, however, no goods were supplied. Moreover, during inquiry, the three vendor firms to whom payment was made by the complainant-Company on behalf of accused-Company, were found to be in the nature of shell Companies as same persons stood as Directors in the Vendor firms as well.

6. On the other hand, Mr. Karan Singh and Mr. Rohit Aggarwal, Advocates put in appearance on behalf of the complainant-Company, by way of filing of Memorandum of appearance and submit that one of the Directors of the vendor-Company is the wife of the petitioner and only forged & fabricated invoices were generated as no goods have been transferred from the vendor-Company; the amount received in the vendor-Company is routed through the Company of the petitioners through Bank transaction(s); there is incriminating material against the petitioners and they are required for custodial interrogation for recovery of the amount which they have received through deception. It is further contended that the petitioners are habitual offenders as there are 23 cases pending against the accused Company and has placed on record a photocopy of the same. It is also contended that GST number issued to the petitioners' Company has been cancelled by the concerned Department and in support thereof has also supplied a photocopy of the same which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties; seriousness of the allegations, gravity of the offence



in terms of magnitude of amount involved and also antecedents of the present petitioners, this Court does not find any merit to allow the petitions for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary for effecting proper investigation, hence petitioners are not entitled for discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. In “**C.B.I. vs. Anil Sharma**”, **1997(7) SCC 187**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of aforesaid discussion, there is no merit in the present petitions; the same are hereby dismissed.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

27.01.2026
Sonia Puri

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No