



CRM-M-16403-2026

1

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

218

CRM-M-16403-2026

Date of decision: 23.04.2026

PARAS BHAI MEHTA**....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****....Respondent****CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present:- Mr. Varun Dhingra, Advocate (Through VC)
Mr. Shivam Sachdeva, Advocate and
Mr. Sandesh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNSS"), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.38 dated 22.01.2026 registered under Sections 61(2), 318, 351 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station DLF, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1).

2. On 08.04.2026, the following order was passed by this Court: -

"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.38 dated 22.01.2026 registered under Sections 61(2), 318, 351 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station DLF, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1).



Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he merely facilitated a meeting between the complainant and accused persons and had no role in the subsequent transactions. He submits that the complainant and accused. person had independently entered into the business dealing with each other and the petitioner had no role or involvement whatsoever in the business transactions. He submits that the petitioner is not a beneficiary directly or indirectly of the alleged outstanding amount and no amount was ever received or transferred to be credited into his account. He further submits that the petitioner is also not likely the beneficiary of the amount that has been deposited by the complainant. He submits that the entire dispute is civil in nature which has been given criminal color. He further submits that the petitioner is running the business of electronic items and is a family. man. The petitioner has clean antecedents. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report and she relying upon the same has vehemently opposed the petition for bail and submits that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. She submits that the petitioner was hand in gloves with the accused persons and had actively participated in the dealings.

At this stage, Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed his memo of appearance. The same is taken on record. He has opposed to the relief sought by the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner actively participated in introducing the complainant to the principal accused persons and represented himself to be representative of the accused company. He further submits that forged documents, including government letters and tender



documents were shown to induce the complainant to supply goods worth more than 2 crores.

Adjourned to 23.04.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 08.04.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions of SI Chunni Lal, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant submits that the offence committed by petitioner is serious in nature and hence, opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 08.04.2026 passed by this Court, is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

23.04.2026

Gurpreet

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

- i) Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No
- ii) Whether reportable? Yes/No