



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125+246

CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Amit Katyal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. R.S. Cheema, Sr. Advocate and
Mr. Tanvir Ahmed Mir, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Vibhu Agnihotri, Advocate,
Ms. Tanu Bedi, Advocate,
Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Satish Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Advocate
for the applicant in CRM-11921-2025.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

CRM-25485-2025

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the copies of medical reports of the petitioner dated 30.06.2025 are taken on record as Annexure P-37, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.144 dated 02.06.2024 under Sections 81 and 82 of the Registration Act, 1908, Sections 177, 420, 423, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Sector-40,



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

Gurugram, who was earlier granted interim bail on medical grounds by this Court vide detailed order dated 07.02.2025, which was subsequently extended vide order dated 21.05.2025, in light of the persisting medical ailments of the petitioner and the completion of investigation.

2. On the previous dates of hearing, this Court, while granting interim bail to the petitioner, took into account his health condition as recorded in the medical status report submitted by the State, and the concession of bail granted to him on identical medical grounds by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in a case under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (for short, 'PMLA').

3. Relevant portions of the medical report revealed that the petitioner, is a post-operative case of bariatric surgery, and is suffering from multiple chronic conditions, including hypertension, diabetes mellitus, fluctuating blood pressure and sugar levels, as well as cardiac complications. The petitioner was also reported to be on psychiatric medication and struggling with dietary management, which is critical in view of the fact that approximately 75% of his stomach has been surgically.

4. In light of these considerations and the non-objection from the learned State counsel, this Court had vide order dated 07.02.2025, granted interim bail to the petitioner on medical grounds, which was subsequently extended on 21.05.2025, after noting that the medical condition of the petitioner remained substantially unchanged. The learned State counsel on the previous date of hearing i.e. 21.05.2025 on



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

instructions, did not dispute the medical status reports or the pendency of proceedings arising out of the PMLA in which bail had already been granted by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, and the challenge thereto had been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 07.04.2025.

5. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has once again drawn the attention of this Court to the latest medical report dated 30.06.2025, annexed as Annexure P-37, which reflects a continued deterioration in the health of the petitioner. As per this report, not only do the pre-existing conditions persist, but the petitioner has also been found to have elevated LDL levels and has now been advised to undergo coronary angiography, a procedure indicative of cardiac risk.

6. It has still further been submitted by the learned senior counsel that the investigation in the present case is complete, and the challan was presented on 01.03.2025, followed by a supplementary challan dated 03.07.2025. It has still further been asserted that the case is founded entirely upon documentary evidence coupled with the fact that no recovery is either pending or required from the petitioner. Learned senior counsel submits that the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future, as none of the 54 prosecution witnesses have yet been examined; the petitioner had not misused the concession of interim bail, either in this case or in the PMLA proceedings. It has still further been prayed that further incarceration of the petitioner would be unsafe and medically inappropriate since the petitioner has suffered medical damage as a result of the surgical procedures and complications.

7. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

authenticity of the medical condition of the petitioner as outlined in his medical reports. It has also been conceded by the learned State counsel that the petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court vide order dated 07.02.2025 based on the medical report furnished by the State itself. It has also been conceded that the investigation stands complete qua the petitioner, the charge sheet has been filed, and that the case is documentary in nature.

8. However, learned State counsel has reiterated the serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who as per him is the mastermind of a large syndicate engaged in multiple acts of fraud, misrepresentation, and conspiracy relating to the illegal transfer of land. It is submitted that during the course of investigation, it emerged that the petitioner was actively operating and controlling various companies, which were allegedly used as fronts to acquire immovable properties at significantly undervalued prices. It has been further alleged that the petitioner, in collusion with the other co-accused, generated and accumulated illicit funds amounting to approximately Rs.500 crores, which were subsequently siphoned off for personal enrichment.

9. It may also be noted that Mr. Neeraj Gupta, learned counsel, filed CRM No.11921 of 2025 seeking to assist the Court on behalf of the respondents. However, upon being repeatedly queried Mr. Neeraj Gupta, failed to establish any *locus standi*, as he is neither the complainant nor an aggrieved party in the present proceedings. His prayer to assist is, therefore, entirely devoid of any merit and, therefore,



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

CRM No.11921 of 2025 deserves to be dismissed.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record, including the earlier medical reports, the latest report dated 30.06.2025, annexed as Annexure P-37.

11. It is evident that the petitioner continues to suffer from serious, chronic, and progressively worsening health conditions, including cardiac risk, which necessitate specialised medical treatment and the same may not be feasible within the confines of the jail where he is lodged. This position has not been contested by the learned State counsel, on instructions.

12. Pertinently, it stands admitted that the investigation is complete, and the chargesheet as well as the supplementary chargesheet have also been presented. The entire case of the prosecution is based on documentary evidence. It is also pertinent to note that the petitioner was previously granted bail on medical grounds in a case under the PMLA by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, and the SLP challenging that bail was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as recently as on 07.04.2025.

13. Furthermore, the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future does not arise since none of the prosecution witnesses have been examined.

14. In the the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose moreso when his life and health could be at serious risk. This Court, therefore, deems it appropriate to admit the petitioner to regular bail, particularly in view of the principle of parity with the



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

orders passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court which was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as already noticed in the earlier part of this order.

15. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing fresh bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, subject to the following stringent conditions :

- (i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat, or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any investigating agency.
- (ii) The petitioner shall remain present before the learned Trial Court on each and every date of hearing.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not seek unnecessary adjournments or cause delay in the proceedings.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the learned Trial Court; he shall surrender his passport, if not already surrendered.
- (v) The learned Trial Court shall insist on furnishing of two heavy local sureties, and may impose any additional condition as it deems fit.

16. In case the petitioner is found involved in any other criminal activity during the pendency of the trial or violates any condition imposed herein, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an



CRM-M-2773-2025 (O&M)

appropriate application seeking cancellation of bail.

17. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

07.07.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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