**In the Court of Preeti Sukhija, Additional Sessions Judge,
Ludhiana. (UID No.PB0276).**

B.A. No. 6531 dated 21.07.2026.
Date of Order:28.07.2026.

Parveen Kumar son of Girdhari Lal Dadu, resident of House No. 78, Green Field, Pakhowal Road, Model Town, Ludhiana.

. . . . . . **Applicant-accused.**

Versus

1. State of Punjab.
2. Gagan Jindal son of Ramesh Chand, resident of House No. 1050, Dayal Nagar, Ghumar Mandi, Ludhiana.

. . . . **Respondent-complainant.**

FIR No.208 dated 18.07.2026.
U/ss 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS.
P.S. Division No.8, Ludhiana.

[Bail application U/s 482 of BNSS, 2023.]

Present: Sh. Ashish Singla,Advocate, counsel for applicant-accused.
Sh.Rajesh Sharma, Addl.P.P for the State.
Sh.Sachin Vasudeva, Advocate, counsel for complainant.

ORDER

Status report produced, which is taken on the record. Police record also produced. Learned counsel for complainant has also placed on record case status downloaded from e. court, order dated

29.8.2022, statement of account, photostat copies of cheques produced, which are taken on the record.

2. Applicant-accused has filed the present bail application under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail for offence under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS.

3. Learned counsel for applicant-accused has argued that applicant-accused never indulged himself in any illegal or unlawful activities. The present FIR is not maintainable. The complainant himself is guilty of doing illegal acts. The entire story in the FIR has been concocted by the prosecution. Applicant-accused has already filed a civil suit against the respondent-complainant, which is pending in the Court. The present dispute is a civil in nature and the police has given a criminal colour to the civil dispute. Nothing is to be recovered from him nor his custodial interrogation is required. He is ready to join the investigation and hence the prayer has been made to allow the present bail application. Reliance has been placed upon **State represented by the C.B.I.Vs. Anil Sharma, Sony Rishi @ Soni Rishi @ Sonu Vs. State of Punjab, Criminal Misc.No. M-32949 of 2025 and Rohtash Versus State of Haryana, Law Finder Doc 1d# 272226.**

4. Notice of the bail application was given to the State. Learned Addl.P.P for the State assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that allegations against the applicant-accused are serious in nature and he does not deserve for any leniency. Investigation is still going on custodial interrogation of the applicant-accused is also required, so prayer

for dismissal of the bail application has been made.

5. I have heard learned counsel for applicant-accused,learned Addl.P.P for the State, assisted by learned counsel for complainant and have gone through the record carefully with their able assistance.

6. Perusal of record shows that FIR in the present case has been registered against the accused on the statement of complainant Gagan Jindal, on the allegations that he has been working for the last about 21 years as EA-2 Director with Janpath Real Estate & VIPL South City, Ludhiana. Besides this, he is also engaged in his own property sale and purchase business. He further stated that his family has had close family relations with Praveen Dadu and his family since 2015, and both families regularly participated in each other's joys and sorrows. In 2017, Praveen Dadu and Darpan Dadu told him that they were engaged in the business of tractor spare parts and that it was a highly profitable business. They assured him that if he invested money in their business, they would pay him handsome returns. Since he had close family relations with Praveen Dadu, he trusted them and agreed to invest his money. Accordingly, during 2017, on different dates, he transferred money from his wife Rajeshwari Jindal's HDFC Bank Account No. 50100067899015, Mall Road Branch, Ludhiana, as follows:

* ₹9,50,000 through cheque dated 30.1.2017

* ₹2,50,000 through cheque on 30.01.2017.

* ₹7,00,000 through RTGS on 17.03.2017.

* ₹8,50,000 by cheque to Pooja Dadu, wife of Darpan Dadu.

* ₹8,00,000 into the bank account of Darpan Dadu.

Thus, he paid a total of ₹26,00,000. In return, they handed over security cheques to him. Thereafter, to gain his confidence, Darpan Dadu and others paid him approximately ₹4,35,000 as profit on different dates during 2017–2018. He has produced photocopies of the relevant bank statements. Subsequently, Praveen Dadu again called him to his house and told him that since the earlier investment had been made through proper banking channels, the profit earned was comparatively less. He said that if he could invest cash, they would be able to provide him with much higher profits. Since they had already paid him profits earlier, his confidence in them increased further. Influenced by the representations made by Praveen Dadu and his family members, and in the presence of their common close friends Lalit Jindal and Krishna Garg, he paid them a total cash amount of ₹3,00,00,000 (Three Crore) on different occasions during 2021–2022. Against this amount, they issued several security cheques drawn on their bank accounts. Praveen Dadu handed over Cheque Nos. 328641, 328681, 328680, 084532, 084533, 084534, 084535, 927241, 721231, 151706, 143453, 623952, 426292, 145688, 249669, 145687, 056533, 056534, 019792, 019793 and 056526, all of which are still in his possession. About six months later, they paid him ₹15,00,000 in cash as profit. Thereafter, they did not pay him any further profit. Whenever he demanded either the return of his investment or the promised profit, they started making excuses, saying that a substantial amount was receivable from the market and that they would repay him, along with the profit, as soon as those amounts were recovered. However, they did not return any money. Thereafter, he repeatedly visited the house of Praveen Dadu and his family members and earnestly requested them to return his money, but they paid no heed. Finally, he warned Praveen Dadu that if his money was not returned, he would initiate civil proceedings on the basis of the security cheques issued by them. Out of fear of such legal action, Darpan Dadu paid him a total of ₹8,00,000 on different occasions up to 2024, and Praveen Dadu paid him another ₹4,00,000 up to 2025. Thus, the accused persons obtained a total of ₹3,27,50,000 (Three Crore Twenty-Seven Lakh Fifty Thousand) from him, out of which they returned only ₹27,00,000, leaving the remaining amount unpaid. By acting in collusion with one another and winning his confidence, they obtained a total sum of ₹3,27,50,000 (Three Crore Twenty-Seven Lakh Fifty Thousand) from him. They have dishonestly failed to return the remaining amount of approximately ₹3 crore, thereby cheating him.

7. On the basis of aforesaid statement, the law has been set into motion, case against the accused for offence under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS has been registered.

8. The record prima facie reveals that the applicant-accused, along with the co-accused, is alleged to have acted in concert and induced the complainant to part with a total amount of ₹3,27,50,000 (Rupees Three Crore Twenty-Seven Lakh Fifty Thousand only). It is alleged that despite repeated demands, an amount of approximately ₹3 crore remains

unpaid. The allegations are grave in nature and require a thorough investigation. The investigation is at a crucial stage. The custodial interrogation of the applicant-accused is necessary to ascertain the complete modus operandi adopted in the commission of the alleged offence, to verify the financial transactions, to identify the role of each accused, and to trace the flow of the cheated amount. This Court also finds substance in the contention of the prosecution that custodial interrogation of the applicant-accused is essential for effecting recovery of the cheated amount, relevant documents, electronic devices, bank records, and other incriminating material. Such recovery cannot be effectively achieved if the applicant-accused is granted the concession of bail at this stage. There is also a reasonable apprehension that, if released on bail, the applicant-accused may tamper with the prosecution evidence, destroy or conceal material evidence, or influence and intimidate the complainant and other prosecution witnesses. Considering that the accused persons are alleged to have acted in collusion with one another, the possibility of their coordinating to frustrate the investigation cannot be ruled out. Economic offences involving huge financial loss stand on a different footing, as they affect not only the individual complainant but also undermine public confidence in commercial dealings. The gravity of the allegations, the magnitude of the amount involved, the stage of investigation, the necessity for custodial interrogation and recovery, and the likelihood of interference with the investigation are all relevant considerations while deciding the present application. The law relied upon by the learned counsel for the applicant-accused referred to above are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case and are, therefore, distinguishable.

9. The contention raised on behalf of the applicant-accused that the dispute is of a civil nature and that civil litigation is pending between the parties also does not persuade this Court to grant the concession of bail. Merely because civil proceedings have been initiated or are pending between the parties does not *ipso facto* render the criminal proceedings untenable where the allegations, on a prima facie consideration, disclose the commission of cognizable offences. Civil and criminal proceedings may proceed simultaneously if the facts give rise to both civil liability and criminal culpability. In the present case, the allegations are not confined to a mere breach of contractual obligations but prima facie disclose dishonest inducement, misappropriation of a substantial amount, and acts constituting cognizable offences, which require a thorough investigation. Therefore, the pendency of civil litigation does not dilute the gravity of the allegations nor does it entitle the applicant-accused to the concession of bail.

10. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, as the same may prejudice either party during the trial, this Court is of the considered view that no ground is made out for granting the concession of bail to the applicant-accused at this stage. Accordingly, the present bail application is dismissed.

Nothing expressed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the ultimate merits of the main case. Police record be returned. File of this bail application be consigned to the record room after due compilation.

Pronounced in open court.
Date of order:28.07.2026.

(Preeti Sukhija)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Ludhiana.
(UID No. PB0276)

This order has been directly dictated on the computer.
Kashmira Singh, Stenographer G-I