

2025:PHHC:158222



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M No.16394 of 2025
Date of decision: 14.11.2025

Gagandeep Ratti ... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Pradeep Virk, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Arvind Sachdeva, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Sandeep Chopra, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short
'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
11	06.02.2025	Division No.3, District Police Commissionerate (Jalandhar)	420, 406, 465, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition

2025:PHHC:158222



are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint filed by the complainant Vinod Kumar on the allegations that he had been induced by the petitioner to part with a sum of Rs.16 lakhs on the premise that the petitioner through his brother serving in Railway Department would arrange for a contract between the complainant and YONEX Company Delhi for supplying badminton Rackets at wholesale rates. Forged bills were issued and despite receipt of the aforementioned amount, rackets were not supplied to the complainant. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 24.02.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is a reputed player of badminton and is running a Badminton Academy that gives training to youngsters. The dispute between the parties is purely out of business transaction and is civil in nature but has been given a criminal colour. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. He has paid the entire settled amount to the respondent No.2. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. It would not be out of place to mention here that the matter had been referred to Mediation & Conciliation Centre of this Court and a report has been received that the parties have settled their dispute

2025:PHHC:158222



amicably. A written settlement has also been filed. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has stated in the Court today that the entire settled amount has been paid by the petitioner to him. Given the nature of the allegations and the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. As such, a case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to his surrendering before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and joining investigation and as and when subsequently required thereafter and on his surrender within that period, he shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer on furnishing personal/surety bonds to its satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

5. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

14.11.2025

manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No