



In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh

(I) CRM-3296-2025 in/and  
CRM-M-524-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 27.01.2025

Shard Sharma ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

(II) CRM-3284-2025 in/and  
CRM-M-1323-2025 (O&M)

Maninder Pal Singh @ Maninder Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Yukti Garg, Advocate with  
Mr. Ravinder Gill, Advocate, for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Atttri, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

| FIR NO. | DATE       | POLICE STATION                                                | OFFENCES                                                     |
|---------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22      | 12.01.2022 | Division-B Police Commissionerate Amritsar, District Amritsar | 408, 381, 420 and 120-B IPC (Section 409 IPC added later on) |

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

CRM-3296-2025 in CRM-M-524-2025 and  
CRM-3284-2025 in CRM-M-1323-2025

In view of the reasons mentioned in the applications, the same are allowed and Mr. Nirmal Singh (complainant) is impleaded as party as



CRM-M Nos.524 & 1323 of 2025 (O&M) - 2 -

respondent No.2 in both the petitions. Amended memo of parties annexed with the application are taken on record.

**CRM-M-524-2025 and**  
**CRM-M-1323-2025**

1. This order shall dispose of the above mentioned two petitions filed on behalf of Shard Sharma, Maninder Pal Singh @ Maninder Singh and Narinder Kumar Tandon @ Narinder Kumar seeking grant of anticipatory bail in the above mentioned FIR. While, this is the second petition filed on behalf of petitioner Shard Sharma, the petitioners Maninder Pal and Narinder have approached this Court for the first time.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Nirmal Singh, wherein he stated that he is running business of electronics under the name and style of M/s Nirmal TV Centre at Amritsar since the year 1978 and is having business transactions with various finance companies including Bajaj Fincorp, Capital Finance (now IDFC First Bank), HDFC Finance and HDB Finance and that on account of volume of work, the representatives of the said finance companies used to sit at his shop to complete formalities of financing electronics goods. It is alleged that Maninderjit Singh, an employee of Bajaj Fincorp, Varinder Singh, an employee of Capital Finance (now IDFC First Bank), Naresh Kumar Tandon, an employee of Whirlpool and Shard Sharma, an Accountant working in complainant's firm, connived with each other and cheated the complainant of huge amount by replacing



new products with defective articles without his consent and by forging documents and by selling products without updating the particulars on the portals of the finance companies.

3. At this stage, Mr. H.S.Rakhra, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed memo of appearance. The same is taken on record.
4. It is the specific case of the prosecution that while Shard Sharma was working as an accountant in the complainant's firm M/s Nirmal TV Centre, the other two co-accused namely Maninder Pal Singh @ Maninder Singh and Narinder Kumar Tandon @ Narinder Kumar were working in two companies namely Whirlpool and Bajaj and that they all had connived with each other so as to defraud the complainant in the manner indicated above.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that there has been a substantial change in circumstances ever since the dismissal of the first petition filed on behalf of Shard Sharma and that as of now the matter stands amicably resolved and the complainant does not have any objection for grant of anticipatory bail.
6. Opposing the petitions, learned State counsel submitted that it is a case where the complainant had been defrauded of a huge amount of Rs.40 lakhs. He has however, feigned ignorance regarding the factum of compromise. However, the learned counsel for complainant is present in the Court and has endorsed the factum of



compromise and has categorically stated that the complainant does not have any objection in case the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail.

- 7. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
- 8. In view of the aforestated position, wherein the matter is stated to have been amicably compromised and the complainant does not have any objection for grant of anticipatory bail, both the petitions are accepted and the petitioners be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482 BNSS.
- 9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of each connected cases.

27.01.2025  
mohan

( GURVINDER SINGH GILL)  
JUDGE

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Whether speaking /reasoned | Yes / No |
| Whether Reportable         | Yes / No |