

2026:PHHC:066062



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

152

CRM-M-17-2026

Anant Kumar and another

...Petitioners

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**Date of decision: 29.04.2026****Date of Uploading : 30.04.2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Gaurav Chopra, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate and  
Ms. Seerat Saldi, Advocate for the petitioners.  
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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.195 dated 22.12.2025 registered for offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 61 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Sector 7, Panchkula.

2. The prosecution case, as emanating from the FIR, is that the complainant, namely Dr. Karan Gupta, a dental surgeon by profession, alleged that his daughter, who aspired to pursue an MBBS course, could not secure admission through NEET-2024. In August 2024, through his co-brother Pallav Bansal, the complainant came into contact with the main accused, namely Manav Singla, who allegedly assured him of arranging a management quota seat in a private medical college. It has

been alleged that the main accused initially received a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- in cash as token money and thereafter induced the complainant to part with further amounts, including Rs.2,00,000/- towards participation in counselling. Despite repeated assurances, no admission materialized in the initial rounds. Thereafter, on 27.11.2024, the complainant was allegedly introduced to the present petitioners at Panchkula, who represented themselves as having strong connections with the Directorate of Medical Education and Research (DMER), Haryana. It is further alleged that a deal for securing an MBBS seat was finalized for a total consideration of Rs.1.27 crores, pursuant to which an additional amount of Rs.32,00,000/- was paid by the complainant. It has been further alleged that despite receipt of the aforesaid amounts, the daughter of the complainant did not secure admission, and only a part of the amount was subsequently returned, while a substantial amount remained outstanding. The complainant has further alleged that when he approached the accused persons for return of the remaining amount, he was threatened with dire consequences. In this manner, the complainant was duped of the huge amount and the allegations of cheating, criminal breach of trust and threats were levelled which led to registration of the instant FIR.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners have contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the FIR in question and no specific role has been attributed to them in the alleged transaction. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that neither any money was demanded nor received by the petitioners and that the entire dispute, if any, is between the complainant and the main accused, namely Manav Singla. According to learned senior counsel, the petitioners are merely

consultants assisting in admission processes and have no role whatsoever in any alleged fraudulent transaction. It has been further contended that the FIR is an abuse of the criminal process, having been instituted to exert pressure for recovery of money arising out of what is essentially a civil dispute. Reliance has been placed upon an inquiry conducted at Faridkot, wherein no concrete evidence was found indicating any payment having been made to the petitioners. Learned senior counsel has also emphasized that the complainant has failed to disclose or substantiate the source of the alleged funds, thereby casting serious doubt on the veracity of the prosecution case. It has further been contended that the daughter of the complainant has already secured admission in a medical college, and thus, the dispute, if any, pertains only to settlement of accounts between the complainant and the main accused. It has been further submitted that the petitioners have neither misappropriated any amount nor acted with any dishonest intention from the inception of the transaction. Learned senior counsel has further asserted that the complainant had earlier approached various authorities, including those at Faridkot, Police Station Chandimandir, but no action was taken, which, according to the petitioners, reflects mala fide intent on the part of the complainant. It has been further contended that the present FIR has been registered without proper justification and without due consideration of the material collected during earlier inquiries. It has also been submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigating agency, and there is no likelihood of their absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence in the event they are granted the concession of

anticipatory bail. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners has been prayed for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, contending that the allegations against them are serious in nature. According to learned State counsel, the complainant was dishonestly induced to part with a substantial amount of money on the false promise of securing an MBBS seat for his daughter through the management quota. It has been submitted that the allegations are not merely of a simple monetary dispute but prima facie disclose the commission of cognizable and grave offences involving cheating, criminal breach of trust and criminal conspiracy. It has further been contended that the petitioners, in connivance with co-accused Manav Singla, have played an active role in the commission of the alleged offence. Learned State counsel has further argued that the petitioners cannot escape liability merely on the ground that no amount was directly received by them. It has been contended that the petitioners have actively participated in the alleged transaction and facilitated the commission of the offence, and therefore, their custodial interrogation is indispensable to unearth the larger conspiracy, identify the role of other involved persons and effect recovery of the cheated amount. It has also been submitted that economic offences of such magnitude have a serious impact on society at large and warrant a thorough and effective investigation. Learned State counsel has apprehended that in case the petitioners are granted the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage, the same may hamper the ongoing investigation. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, dismissal of the present petition has been prayed for.

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 case put forth in the FIR in question, indubitably, serious and grave allegations have been levelled against the petitioners. The allegations in the present case are not vague in nature but prima facie disclose a coordinated and concerted effort on the part of the accused persons, including the petitioners, to induce the complainant into parting with a substantial amount of money on the false pretext of securing admission to an MBBS course for his daughter. From the material collected during the course of inquiry and investigation, it emerges that the petitioners were introduced to the complainant by the main accused, Manav Singla, and are alleged to have projected themselves as persons having influence and connections with the Directorate of Medical Education and Research (DMER), Haryana, thereby defrauding the complainant of a substantial amount on the promise of securing a medical seat. Furthermore, the presence of the petitioners at the meeting dated 27.11.2024, where the alleged deal was finalized, and their role in representing that they could secure a management quota seat, prima facie indicate their active participation in the transaction. The plea of the petitioners that no money has been directly received by them does not, at this stage, ipso facto exonerate them from liability. In the considered opinion of this Court, in cases involving conspiracy and cheating, the role of each participant is to be examined in the overall context of the transaction. The material on record suggests that the petitioners have allegedly facilitated the transaction, which constitutes a significant role in the inducement of the complainant. The magnitude of the amount

involved and the manner in which the transaction is alleged to have been executed prima facie indicate that the offence is not isolated but forms part of a larger, organized and premeditated design. The plea raised by the petitioners regarding prior inquiries and absence of documentary proof at this stage does not dilute the seriousness of the allegations. The investigation is still ongoing and the exact money trail, as well as the precise role of each accused, is yet to be conclusively determined. The stand of the investigating agency before this Court is that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is indispensable to unearth the full extent of the conspiracy and to identify the involvement of other persons. In view of the seriousness of the allegations and the prima facie material on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage.

7. The plea of the petitioners that the matter is purely civil in nature also does not persuade this Court at this stage. It is trite law that anticipatory bail is an extraordinary remedy not to be granted as a matter of course particularly in cases involving heinous/economic offences. While considering anticipatory bail, the Court must strike a balance between the right of the individual to liberty and the need for free, fair and effective investigation. The allegations involve a well planned conspiracy whereby complainant was defrauded of his valuable money, this Court does not consider it appropriate to grant bail at this nascent stage. In the considered opinion of this Court, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage may likely to hamper the on-going investigation. No cause *nay* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it

can be deciphered that the petitioners have been falsely implicated into the FIR in question.

8. 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 interests. 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. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that *prima facie* case is not made out against the petitioners. The material which has come on record and preliminary investigation, appear to be established a reasonable basis for the accusations. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In ***State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187 : 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

*“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 informations 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 task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”*

9. Considering the gravity of the offence, the magnitude of alleged fraud, the conduct of the petitioners and the stage of investigation as also the necessity of custodial interrogation to unearth the complete *modus operandi*, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the factual *milieu* of the case in hand.

10. In view of the prevenient ratiocination, it is ordained thus:

- (i) The instant petition is devoid of merits and is hereby dismissed.
- (ii) Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.
- (iii) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

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

April 29, 2026  
*Ajay*

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