

2025:PHHC:077366



203.

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

CRM-M-12400-2025

Date of decision: 01.07.2025

Jatinder Singh Sachdeva

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab with SI Kewal Singh.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in case FIR No.05, dated 09.03.2017, under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC and Sections 13(1), 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Jalandhar.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 05.03.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that a perusal of the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, reveals that neither was the petitioner named therein nor was he assigned any role in the alleged crime i.e. of fabricating and forging documents on the basis of which as many as 99 loans from the bank were raised between 01.05.2013 to 30.04.2016. Learned counsel has still further argued that initially challan

was presented against two persons, Ambika Devi and Anita; the petitioner has now been sought to be implicated in the present case after 08 years of the registration of the FIR in question for allegedly attesting some fabricated mortgage deed in the year 2014 which was entered into between the co-accused, Mukesh Kumar, and the Bank. It has been asserted by the learned counsel that it is not even the case of the prosecution that any person had impersonated said Mukesh Kumar or the Bank officials. Rather, the parties to the alleged fabricated mortgage deed had been rightly identified by the petitioner. In support, learned counsel has also annexed the mortgage deed as Annexure P-5 along with the enquiry report as Annexure P-2 wherein it stands reflected that the petitioner had not been named or attributed any role in the alleged crime, although as many as 26 persons had been named.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 05.03.2025, petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 05.03.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 01, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No