



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CRM-M-65029-2024  
Decided on : 04.03.2025

Jagjit Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

PRESENT: None for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. In the present anticipatory bail petition, on 23.12.2024,  
following order was passed by this Court:-

*"1. Through present petition, petitioner – Jagjit Singh is seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.70 dated 22.04.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Division No.6, District Jalandhar.*

*2. Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the dispute raised by the complainant is only with regard to the recovery of loan amount to the tune of Rs.4.50 lacs, which was sanctioned and disbursed by the bank on 19.12.2020.*

*Total 48 instalments @ Rs.15,000 per month were required to be paid. Petitioner succeeded in paying few instalments totalling to Rs.1.13 lacs, and thereafter, due to financial crunches, he could not deposit rest of the amount. Resultantly, he is faced with the present FIR.*

*3. Notice of motion.*

*4. On advance notice, Mr. S.S. Gill, Sr. DAG-cum-Public Prosecutor, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State, and submits that along with the interest, liability upon the petitioner is now*



*approximately Rs.8,00,000/- and he is member of one of the gangs who purchases the vehicles and then stop paying the loan amount.*

5. *Mr. Bhrigu Dutt Sharma, Advocate, has filed his memorandum of appearance, and accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.*

6. *Upon the statement made by learned State counsel, counsel for the petitioner submits that he is ready to deposit the complete amount in instalments, in case, some protection is granted to him by this Court.*

7. *Let 50% of the total due amount be deposited by the petitioner, within a period of one month from today.*

8. *To examine bona fide of the petitioner, adjourned to 27.02.2025.*

9. *Till the next date of hearing only, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.”*

2. Thereafter, on 27.02.2025, none appeared on behalf of the petitioner and following order was passed:-

*“ Despite passover, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.*

*In the interest of justice, adjourned to 04.03.2025.”*

3. Today also, despite the case having been called twice, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant informs that 50% of the total due amount, as directed by this Court vide order dated 23.12.2024, has also not been deposited by the petitioner, till date.

5. Dismissed for want of prosecution.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

**March 04, 2025**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*