228

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

**CRM-M No.24370 of 2026
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026**

Sanjay Sinha

….. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

….. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

*****

Present: Mr. P. S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Tarun Yadav, Advocate
for the complainants.

Mr. L. S. Saini, Advocate (thorugh VC)
for the victim-Meenu Gupta.

*****

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.174, dated 28.06.2023, under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Udyog Vihar, District Gurugram.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sumit Sharma. It was alleged that the complainant was the Authorized Representative of M/s Om Logistics Limited. It was alleged that the

company of the accused, i.e. M/s GGJ Solutions Private Limited operating the brand name 'Ichhapurti' having its corporate office at Plot No.112, 3rd Floor, Udyog Vihar, Phase-1, Gurugram. Sanjay Sinha (Director), i.e. the petitioner and others entered into the business arrangements with various parties for providing logistics, transportation, manpower supply, material supply services and also for operating Super Franchise and Business Partner Models. It was alleged that during the period, i.e. from July, 2021 to March, 2022, the accused company availed the services of logistics, transportation, manpower supply and material supply from several complainant parties and also induced various shopkeepers and business entities to become super franchise and business partners by promising profitable business opportunities. It was further alleged that after completion of the services and transactions, the complainant parties raised bills and invoices as per the agreed terms, however the accused company failed to clear the outstanding dues despite repeated requests. It was alleged that the total amount of Rs.3,68,17,844.77/- remained outstanding towards the services provided by various complainant parties including Om Logistics Ltd., Super India Transport Co., Khanna Rentals, Roman Networks Pvt. Ltd, GR Infotech and several super franchise partners such as Maruti Sales, Mohan Automobiles, Ayush Mobile, Soni Mobile and others and despite repeated email reminders, communication and personal meetings, the accused company allegedly avoided the payment and kept postponing the matter, however, ultimately refused to clear the outstanding dues. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner (one of the director) was arrested on 23.02.2026. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.04.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner is a successful, established and reputed businessman, who has been carrying on the business in the field of manpower and services for the last about 21 years under the name and style of Frontline (NCR) Business Solutions Pvt. Ltd. He has submitted that the petitioner is merely an investor in M/s GGJ Solutions Pvt. Ltd and is himself a victim as he was induced to invest Rs.5 Crores in different branches and operational segments of the accused company for purposes, such as payment of salaries, hiring of office spaces, meeting other business and operational expenses, etc. He has further submitted that the petitioner has been made a scapegoat in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner did not hold any share in the accused company and he was only a director and an investor in the company. He has submitted that there are 14 complainants, who have joined the investigation and got their statements recorded before the police or furnished supporting documents and thus, they were cited as witnesses. He has further submitted that out of total 14 complainants, compromise has

been arrived with 13 of the complainants and payments have been duly made to them upon receipt of their dues to their satisfaction. He has further submitted that the remaining complainant, i.e. Sparsh Garg of G S Trading Company, who had claimed that Rs.20.5 lacs was paid to the accused company and sincere efforts have already been made to amicably resolve the dispute by offering the amount reflected in the account books by way of demand draft dated 15.04.2026 for an amount of Rs.19.5 Lacs, however the complainant did not cooperate in arriving at a settlement and is unwilling to take the demand draft prepared towards his actual dues and is instead seeking amount beyond what is lawfully payable. He has submitted that during the course of inquiry proceedings and investigation, certain additional parties subsequently submitted written complaints before the police alleging non payment of their respective dues by the accused company. He has submitted that there are total 56 victims in the present case alleging non payment for an amount of Rs.9,05,40,406/- by the accused company. He has further submitted that there are total 56 victims and the settlement has been arrived with 53 victims, who were shown as aggrieved parties, even though 14 complainants joined the investigation and got their statements recorded. He has submitted that the Investigating Agency in its reply to the bail application filed by the petitioner before the learned trial Court has mentioned that the settlement has already been effected with 53 victims out of total 56 victims by the petitioner involving an amount of Rs.8.5 Crores as evidenced by the written Memorandum of Understandings. He has submitted that the remain non settled allegedly aggrieved persons, though not named in the final report/chargesheet, were Ajay Kumar Singh and Surjeet Kumar Gupta apart from Sparsh Garg of G

S Trading Company. He has further submitted that all the remaining complainants/victims have filed separate FIRs against the petitioner, however, Ajay Kumar Singh, proprietor of Sangam Traders, has already filed a separate case bearing FIR No.602, dated 20.10.2023 in Azamgarh police station, Uttar Pradesh and in that case, the proceedings were stayed by the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court, whereas Surjeet Kumar Gupta of Dulhan Saree Ghar has also filed a case bearing FIR No.70, dated 01.04.2026 in Balia police station, Uttar Pradesh and Sparsh Garg of GS Trading Company has also filed a police complaint before the local police station in Mathura, Uttar Pradesh. He has submitted that the petitioner has already resigned from the Directorship of the accused company on 27.08.2022 and had participated only as an investor, thus, has suffered substantial financial loss of more than Rs.10 Crores. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from 23.02.2026 and has suffered an incarceration of more than 02 months, however, there is no material progress in the trial. He has further submitted that the case of the prosecution is primarily based on the documentary evidence, which is already seized and in the custody of Investigating Agency, however, there is no possibility of tampering with the evidence or influencing the course of investigation. To buttress his arguments, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the decision passed by this Court in '**Maninder Sharma vs. State Tax Officer, State Tax, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab**', **2023(1) RCR (Criminal) 232**. He has submitted that on the similar set of allegations, the petitioner was also nominated in a case bearing FIR No.37, dated 27.02.2026, registered at Police Station Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, wherein the petitioner was granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Special Chief Judicial Magistrate, Meerut. He has submitted that one of the 14 victims, namely, Raghav Mishra, has also got registered one case bearing FIR No.43, dated 01.04.2023 in Police Station Ayana, Auriya, Uttar Pradesh, wherein a compromise has already been effected and the said FIR stands quashed by the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court vide order dated 24.03.2026. He has submitted that apart from the present FIR, there are 32 other cases registered against the petitioner, out of which 15 FIRs have been registered by the complainant/witnesses of the present FIR on the same set of allegations and 09 of those FIRs are against the accused company. He has submitted that even otherwise, to show his *bona fide*, qua remaining 03 victims/complainants of the present FIR, the petitioner has also attached the copies of demand drafts in their favour, i.e. demand draft No.510005 dated 15.04.2026 amounting to Rs.19,50,000/- in favour of GS Trading Company; demand draft No.061906 dated 17.02.2026 amounting to Rs.20,00,000/- in favour of Ajay Kumar Singh and demand draft No.001420 dated 29.02.2026 amounting to Rs.19,35,000/- in favour of Dulhan Saree Ghar. He has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Status report dated 13.05.2026 by way of an affidavit of Vishal, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, EOW, Gurugram on behalf of the respondent-State along with custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court and the same are taken on record. Copies thereof have been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the

submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the present case pertains to a large scale, organized economic fraud, wherein innocent investors and shopkeepers have been induced to part with substantial amounts of money on false assurances of high returns and profitable business opportunities. She has submitted that the petitioner was the Director of the company and during the relevant period, he was actively associated with the affairs of the company. She has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established during the investigation as he has actively been participated in the commission of offence and thereafter, challan has been presented before the Competent Court on 01.04.2026. She has submitted that an amount of Rs.9,44,65,406/- was collected from 59 complainants/investors under the guise of appointing them as super franchisees and business partners. She has further submitted that the petitioner was procured by way of issuance of production warrants and he was joined the investigation on 23.02.2026 and further, was arrested upon receipt of appropriate incriminating evidence against him. She has submitted that the petitioner suffered a disclosure statement on 11.03.2026, in which he has stated that co-accused, Vijay Kumar Sharma was controlling and operating M/s GGJ Solution Pvt. Ltd. from behind the scenes despite being restrained from directly running companies due to earlier fraud cases. She has submitted that the proxy directors and shareholders were appointed to conceal the involvement of Vijay Kumar Sharma, while investors and franchisees were induced to deposit large refundable security amounts on the promise of profitable FMCG franchise business opportunities. She has submitted that the petitioner became investor/director in the company and infused substantial funds into the company, and the accounts of Vijay Kumar Sharma and his family members and thereafter, established the corporate office of the company at Udyog Vihar, Gurugram for expanding its operations in North India. She has submitted that in furtherance of the criminal conspiracy, crores of rupees were collected from investors and franchisees, which were subsequently misappropriated and utilized for company operations and personal purposes. She has submitted that when the investors demanded their deposited money and cheques issued by the company were dishonored, the proceedings under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act were issued against the company and its directors. She has further submitted that upon completion of the investigation, the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was filed on 01.04.2026. She has submitted that out of 37 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined. She has further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender as there are 32 more cases have been registered against the petitioner in different states for the similar offence. She has submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in inducing investors, collecting huge public funds, misappropriating deposited amounts and facilitating the fraudulent activities of the company in furtherance of the criminal conspiracy. She has submitted that 09 other cases have also been registered against the accused company. She has thus submitted that the allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature and there is every likelihood of the petitioner fleeing from justice and possibility of tampering with evidence or witnesses. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record. She thus, has submitted that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

6. Learned counsel for appearing on behalf of the victim, namely, Meenu Gupta, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that Meenu Gupta is one of the victims and she has been duped for more than Rs.2 Crores by the petitioner.

7. At this stage, Mr. Tarun Yadav, Advocate has appeared and filed his vakalatnama(s) on behalf of the complainants-victims, namely, Ankit Khandelwal, Sujeet Kumar Gupta, Ajay Kumar Singh, Sparsh Garg, Sudhir Kumar Verma, and Ayudhiya Prakash, which are taken on record. He has also opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that the present case involves a organized fraud wherein large number of investors, shopkeepers and franchise holders have been cheated of their hard earned money and have suffered huge financial loss due to accused persons. He, however, has submitted that he has no instructions to accept the demand drafts as offered by the petitioner in favour of 03 of the complainants-victims and thus, he refused to accept the same. He has further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and thus, no case for grant him the concession of regular bail is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

8. Heard.

9. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that there are 14 complainants and out of these 14 complainants, a compromise has been arrived at with 13 complainants and payments have been duly made to them upon receipt of their dues to their satisfaction. During the investigation, certain other parties subsequently filed complaints before the police alleging non payment of their respective

dues by the accused company and thus, there are total 56 victims in the present case alleging non payment for an amount of Rs.9,05,40,406/- by the accused company and out of which, the settlement has been arrived with 53 victims. As contended before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner that to show his bona fide, he has also appended the copies of demand drafts qua remaining 03 victims. However, learned counsel for the complainants-victims has refused to accept the same. This Court cannot compel the complainants-victims to compromise the matter and accept the demand drafts as offered by the petitioner. As submitted by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already resigned from the Directorship of the accused company on 27.08.2022 and had participated only as an investor, thus, has suffered substantial financial loss of more than Rs.10 Crore is a subject matter of trial. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 23.02.2026 and has suffered an incarceration of more than 02 months. **The present case is primarily based on the documentary evidence.** Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 02 months and 21 days as on 13.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 15 other cases, however, in 05 of the cases, he is on bail and in 01 case, he has been acquitted. Challan in the present case has already been presented and out of 37 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined.

11. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time.

12. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

13. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

14. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

15. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

rittu

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