IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CNR No: PHHC011030992026
2026:PHHC:199113

CRM-M-42072-2026(O&M)

AIR INDIA LTD. **...Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER **…Respondent**

Sr. No.	**Particulars**	
1.	The day when the judgment is reserved	07.10.2026
2.	The day when the judgment is pronounced	11.11.2026
3.	The day when the judgment is uploaded on website	11.11.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgments is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgments and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Argued by: Mr. Sameer Sachdev, Advocate,
Mr. Rohan Sachdev, Advocate,
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate,
Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate,
Mr. Hrithik Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Samay Sandhawalia, Advocate,
Ms. Gurleen Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Aditi Sharma, Advocate and
Ms. Manvi Singh Gahlot, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

***

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 528 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for setting aside order dated 17.04.2026 of learned

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, vide which respondent No. 2 was granted pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 158 dated 20.09.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B Indian Penal Code and Sections 66C, 66D IT Act, 2000, Police Statin Civil Lines, Gurugram.

2. Brief facts, per FIR are that on 28.12.2023, official representative of M/s. Air India Ltd. made a complaint submitting that M/s. Air India Ltd. was a public limited company, in the business of operating international and domestic flights. Two of the booking agents of M/s. Air India Ltd. namely M/s. S.K. Travels and M/s. Charan Singh Travels registered with International Air Transport Association along with others, were involved in fraudulent activities in the process of bookings of air tickets, for various international and domestic flights. In August 2023, complainant learnt about 123 fraudulent transactions carried out by M/s. S.K. Travels between 20.08.2023 and 31.08.2023 by adopting illegal, unscrupulous and fraudulent modus operandi, whereby flight tickets were booked against international credit cards of unknown persons in a fraudulent manner, due to which charge backs were issued by the banks. Since no payment was received by the complainant against the corresponding tickets booked, it suffered huge financial losses. M/s. S.K. Travels deliberately used international credit cards for executing the fraudulent and illegal acts to avoid 3D security checks, which did not apply to international credit cards. For all the transactions, tickets were issued just one to three days prior to the date of flight. The 123 transactions resulted in loss of revenue of Rs.4,31,79,680/-. Similar transactions were done by M/s. Charan Singh Travels. 113 such transactions were discovered from the period 30.07.2023 to 19.08.2023. They too used fake international credit cards to avoid 3D

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

security checks. The 113 transactions resulted in revenue loss to the tune of Rs.99,23,829/-. Destination to which the tickets were booked by these two agents, were also the same, thus, showing a deliberate and intentional pattern. Same 06 credit cards were used by both the travel agents to carry out the fraudulent transactions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No. 2 was the Managing Director and had 70% shareholding in M/s. Ira Entrepreneurs Private Ltd., which duped Air India Ltd. along with its two other agents M/s. S.K. Travels and M/s. Charan Singh Travels by depositing the air fare in respect of the passengers, using international credit cards. The credit card payment shown to have been initially received would later bounce back and the bank entries would be reversed, resulting in “no payment” to the petitioner company. Respondent No. 2 had a significant role in M/s. Ira Entrepreneurs Private Ltd. and was a beneficiary, which learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram failed to notice. She refused to co-operate in police investigation. Her custodial interrogation was necessary, to reveal the full extent of the fraud. The revenue loss resulting from the fraud was Rs. 4,31,79,680/- relatable to 123 fraudulent transactions made by M/s. S.K. Traverls and Rs. 99,23,829/- relatable to 113 transactions carried out by M/s. Charan Singh Travels. The order passed by learned ASJ, Gurugram was perverse, suffered from non-application of judicial mind and failed to appreciate the gravity of the offence, overlooking material facts and circumstances, particularly that respondent No. 2 was in a position of direct responsibility and control over operations of the company and the fraudulent bookings were made through this very company. Custodial interrogation of respondent No. 2 was necessary as her laptops etc. were not yet recovered.

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Moreover, there was danger of evidence being tampered with and witnesses being influenced. He, thus, prayed that order dated 17.04.2026 of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, granting anticipatory bail to respondent No. 2 be set aside.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2, on the other hand, submits that principal role in the offence was attributed to husband of respondent No. 2, also an accused in the case, who had been arrested by the police and detained in custody. All required information and facts were elicited from Rakesh Sharma. The proceeds of crime were not diverted into the bank account of respondent No. 2 and upon presentation of challan, respondent No. 2 had been released on regular bail. The petition was thus rendered infructuous. The mobile phone allegedly used to commit the offence, also did not pertain to respondent No. 2. Therefore, learned trial Court did not commit any illegality while allowing the application for anticipatory bail of respondent No. 2. It was prayed that the petition seeking setting aside of order dated 17.04.2026 of learned ASJ, Gurugram, be dismissed.

5. During the course of investigation, it has transpired that 236 air tickets of Air India were booked through M/s. S.K. Travels and M/s. Charan Singh Travels and payment was made to the petitioner, through international credit/debit cards, 2-3 days prior to the journey. After the journey was undertaken, the payments were reversed by the concerned bank, by way of charge backs, resulting in total financial loss of Rs. 7,64,20,262/- to Air India Ltd. It was further revealed during investigation that identity particulars/Aadhar card of Charan Singh was mis-used for preparing forged and fabricated documents and mobile number of Rakesh Sharma-husband of

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

respondent No. 2 was used in connection with e-mail ID singhcharantravel@gmail.com. 16 air tickets of Air India were booked through Rakesh Sharma, though payments were made in the account of Ira Entrepreneurs Private Ltd. Subsequently, 113 additional tickets were found to have been paid for, using the same international credit cards. Those tickets were also found booked through fraudulent firms M/s. Charan Singh Travels and M/s. S.K. Travels. Although, respondent No. 2 is the Managing Director and 70% share holder of M/s. Ira Entrepreneurs Private Ltd., the principal role in facilitating and creation of fraudulent IATA IDs in the name of M/s. Charan Singh and M/s. S.K. Travels is attributed to co-accused Rakesh Sharma, husband of respondent No. 2.

Learned trial Court has, while granting anticipatory bail to respondent No.2 has observed as under:

> *"As discussed above, the investigating agency is on task since 2024, but failed to collect any evidence against the applicant. The applicant has already joined the investigation in compliance of Order dated 13.04.2026. She shall further co-operate with the investigating agency and supply the relevant record and documents, despite the fact that she claims that she had already supplied the same. The allegations are primarily required to be established through documentary evidence, for which custodial interrogation is not necessary, particularly when the case against her is based largely on suspicion. Moreover, the offences alleged are triable by Magistrate. Hence, the interim pre-arrest bail granted to him is hereby made absolute and pre-arrest bail application is allowed."*

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

6. After going through the entire facts of the case, brought forth by learned counsel(s) for the parties and the impugned order, the Court finds that the order granting anticipatory bail is not based on irrelevant considerations nor has resulted in mis-carriage of justice. There is nothing on record to suggest that after exercise of discretion in her favour, respondent No. 2 has mis-used the concession in any manner. The order assailed before this Court reflects that the Court of learned ASJ, Gurugram has exercised discretion in favour of respondent No. 2 on relevant considerations, keeping in mind the role attributed to her. The order is well-reasoned and does not suffer from the vice of perversity. Thus, there is no sufficient ground to hold that the order has been passed without considering the material on record or by overstepping jurisdiction. There is, no ground to set aside the order granting anticipatory bail to respondent No.2.

Further, it has not been disputed that challan against respondent No. 2 has been presented before learned trial Court. Respondent No. 2 has been allowed regular bail vide order dated 14.08.2026. Although, correctness of the order granting anticipatory bail can be considered by this Court at the behest of the complainant and can be set aside on the ground that the Court granting it, did not consider material facts or crucial circumstances, the position changes, once the concession of regular bail is accorded. The argument that the petition for setting aside the order granting anticipatory bail becomes infructuous after grant of regular bail, merits acceptance. On this ground too, the petition deserves dismissal.

7. The petition stands dismissed.

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an opinion on merits of the case.

9. Pending CRM(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

11.11.2026
Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No

AJAY GOSWAMI
2026.11.11 19:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document