



204

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

CRM-M-22920-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

SUGREEV

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.122 dated 04.12.2025, under Section 111 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3, 4, 5 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956, Police Station Dhakoli, District SAS Nagar, Mohali. This is the first application for anticipatory bail.

2. The FIR discloses that when police party was present at MS Gate Dhakoli, in connection with raid, information was received that business of prostitution was being run in Rok SCO No.11 Ground Floor, the spa SCO No.12 Ground Floor and Elite Spa SCO No.12 First Floor City Court Dhakoli by unknown owner of the spa and unknown tenants who brought girls from outside and supplied them, charging huge amount from customers. If raid be conducted, the culprits could be apprehended. On the information, *ruqa* was sent to the police. A raiding team was constituted and raid was conducted in the said premises. During raid, 6 victims (names withheld) were got released. Accused Sajid was arrested at the spot.

**CRM-M-22920-2026 (O&M)**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, who was a first time offender, was innocent and had been falsely implicated in the FIR which was registered on the basis of secret information. Petitioner was not named in the FIR. The centre was running to provide holistic wellness services and no business of prostitution was being run. Referring to joint affidavit (Annexure P4), it was urged that workers of spa had furnished affidavit that no illegal activity was going on. The case under Section 111 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3, 4, 5 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 was triable by the Court of Magistrate and custodial interrogation of the petitioner was not required. In support of his prayer for anticipatory bail, he relies upon *Sanjay Noonja Vs. State of Haryana, CRM-M-25177-2023 date of decision: 17.05.2023* and *Shashi Parkash Sharma Vs. State of Punjab, CRM-M-19906-2023, date of decision 24.04.2023*.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of IPS, ASP, Sub Division Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar has been filed by State of Punjab, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail arguing that petitioner was in possession of unit bearing No.12, First Floor, situated at City Court Commercial Complex, Dhakoli Zirakpur Tehsil Derabassi District SAS Nagar Mohali Punjab, which premises he had taken on rent from 30.08.2025 upto 29.06.2026. In the garb of running a spa, petitioner was allowing the premises to be used as brothel and was illegally running business of prostitution exploiting innocent girls. During raid, 6 victim girls were released and their statements were recorded. All deposed in their statements under Section 180 BNSS that flesh trade was running in the spa for 4 months and they were in the trade, on payment of money. It was urged that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required. There was sufficient incriminating evidence against the petitioner and thus, it is not a fit case to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

**CRM-M-22920-2026 (O&M)**

5. The rent agreement Annexure R1 placed on record by learned State counsel *prima facie* shows possession of the petitioner in the premises where, as per allegations, flesh trade was being done. Six girls were found involved in the trade who have since been released. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessitated to elicit the involvement of all others in the business. Grant of anticipatory bail, at this stage, would not advance the interest of justice and would rather thwart the statutory investigational powers of the police which is not permissible. Considering all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on the merits, the petition for anticipatory bail is dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Sumit Singla

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No