

2025:PHHC:077375



203/2.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-16750-2025

Date of decision: 01.07.2025

Ashwani Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab with SI Kewal Singh.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in case FIR No.05, dated 09.03.2017, under Sections 409, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC and Sections 13(1), 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Jalandhar Range, Jalandhar.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 26.03.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR in question (annexed as Annexure P-1) nor was there any role, much less specific, attributed to him in the alleged crime i.e. of fabricating and forging documents, on the basis of which, as many as 99 loans from the bank were raised FROM 01.05.2013 TO 30.04.2016. It has been argued by the learned

counsel that initially two persons namely Ambika Devi and Anita were challaned, however, now the petitioner was being implicated after 8 years of the registration of the FIR in question for allegedly attesting some fabricated mortgage deed way back in the year 2014, which was entered into by the co-accused Kirpal Singh and the bank. It has been argued by the learned counsel that it is not even the case of the prosecution that any person had impersonated said Kirpal Singh or the bank officials. Rather, the parties to the alleged fabricated mortgage deed had been rightly identified by the petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 26.03.2025, petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 26.03.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 01, 2025
sanjeev

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