

**243 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-15939-2025****Date of decision : 19.08.2025****Abhishek Jain****.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0383 dated 22.11.2019, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.8, Ludhiana.

2. FIR was lodged on the complaint of Satish Kumar Jain, resident of Ludhiana against as many as 56 persons, which include numerous Insurance Companies, brokers and agents. It had been alleged that under a conspiracy, complainant had been defrauded to the tune of almost ₹4 crores. According to complainant, in the year 2013, started receiving calls from persons, projecting themselves to be the Officers of Finance Department/ Insurance Company and others. Complainant was intimated that the name of the caller was Mahender Singh Grewal, a Finance Department Officer, who has been mentioned by the complainant to be the main accused and who kept on calling the complainant for two years and insisting for taking Birla Sun Life Insurance Policies by making allurements. Thereafter, various investments were made by the complainant. Complainant also named various other persons, who had



allured him to take the policies and that later on, the policies were found to be forged and fabricated documents. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the same was declined by the learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana vide order dated 10.03.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Kiran Bala, Ekta Sharma, Vikas Kumar Gupta and Arun Kumar Gupta. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 05.02.2024, 08.02.2024, 26.02.2024 and 13.05.2024 passed in **CRM-M-60897-2023, CRM-M-63364-2023, CRM-M-65284-2023 and CRM-M-2157-2024**, respectively whereby, co-accused, namely, Kiran Bala, Ekta Sharma, Vikas Kumar Gupta and Arun Kumar Gupta, have been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is at par with the said co-accused. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since the date of his arrest. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner along with co-accused had committed the said offences and duped the complainant for a huge amount. However, He has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above

and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Kiran Bala, Ekta Sharma, Vikas Kumar Gupta and Arun Kumar Gupta.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 07.01.2025. Admittedly, co-accused, namely, Kiran Bala, Ekta Sharma, Vikas Kumar Gupta and Arun Kumar Gupta have been granted regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 05.02.2024, 08.02.2024, 26.02.2024 and 13.05.2024 passed in **CRM-M-60897-2023, CRM-M-63364-2023, CRM-M-65284-2023 and CRM-M-2157-2024**, respectively and the case of the petitioner is at par with that of co-accused.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/Duty Magistrate.

19.08.2025
ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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