



2026:PHHC:027067

2026:PHHC:027067



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

CRM-M No.61385 of 2025

Karamveer

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	17.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	20.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	20.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Lakshay Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Ankit Bhalotia, Advocate and
Mr. Neeraj Goyal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under



2026:PHHC:027067



Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
242	03.05.2023	City Tohana, District Fatehabad	420, 406 and 120-B of IPC (201 of IPC and 3(2) of Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 (For short “Act, 2013”) added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Sahil, alleging therein that the petitioner along with his family members and co-accused was involved in the business of running kitty/committees/monthly lotteries schemes. He had allured the complainant and several other persons to invest money in the schemes floated by him and the money so received was invested by him in different properties. However, after sometime, he suddenly stopped floating the schemes without returning money of the hundreds of investors along with the complainant thereby causing huge loss of money to them and cheating and defrauding them. The complainant alleged that when the petitioner and the co-accused were asked to return the money, instead of doing that, they started extending threats to the depositors. By alleging that crores of rupees had been usurped by the petitioner and the co-accused, prayer was made for taking action.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were



2026:PHHC:027067



initiated. During investigation, the statements of several victims have been recorded. Details of amount due to them had been taken. The petitioner along with some co-accused was asked to join into investigation and was formally arrested on 26.06.2025. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting that he had initiated committee/lottery business in the year 2010, had collected crores of rupees till 2019 and purchased immovable properties from that money and had later transferred the same in the names of his sons. He also admitted that he had deliberately destroyed record to obliterate evidence. Some co-accused were also arrested subsequently. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. The co-accused Jaideep has been extended benefit of regular bail whereas two co-accused have been extended benefit of anticipatory bail. He is not involved in the business of lottery/committee since 2019. There is delay of 4 years in lodging of the FIR which has not been explained. There is no document on record to show the investment of money by the complainant and other victims with the petitioner. No specific role has been attributed to him. No recovery remains to be effected from him. He is not required for further investigation. The dispute between the parties is of civil nature. The immovable properties owned by him are ordered to be attached by the District Magistrate, Fatehabad under the provisions of Act, 2013. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that



2026:PHHC:027067



he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Power of Attorney on behalf of the complainant and other victims has been filed.

6. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. A huge amount of money which was hard earned income of the victims, had been deposited with the petitioner, which has been misappropriated by him. There are chances of petitioners' absconding, if extended benefit of bail. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner is alleged to have induced the complainant and several other persons to deposit money in the kitty/lottery schemes floated by him by alluring them that they would be getting handsome returns for the same. However, as per the allegations, the said money was not returned to the innocent depositors and was rather either converted to his own use by the petitioner or to the use of the co-accused/his family members. Wrongful loss of huge amount of money has been caused to the victims. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to suggest that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and



2026:PHHC:027067



circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the material witnesses are also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered.

9. In light of the foregoing legal principles and other circumstances as discussed above, this Court finds no compelling ground to allow this petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

10. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

20.02.2026
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No