



207

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

CRM-M-17967-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision:07.07.2025

Lakshay Jain

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Abhishek Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.200 dated 03.05.2024, registered under Sections 419, 420, 406, 465, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Punjab State Zirakpur, SAS Nagar, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named initially in the FIR and had no concern with either the exchange of money between the parties or execution of sale deed between the parties. Learned counsel further contends that even from the admitted allegations levelled in the FIR, it is apparent that the complainant had no grouse against the present petitioner and he had levelled allegations primarily against Amardeep Singh, Gurdev Singh and Ashok Kumar. In fact, the petitioner was working as a Deed Writer and after receipt of various Aadhar Cards, he had drafted the sale

deed, which is subject matter of the present FIR. He further contends that he had drafted the sale deed on instructions of the complainant and had no concern with the transfer of the property in any manner. He further contends that the petitioner was not personally known to any of the parties and there was no question of any collusion with the co-accused. Even otherwise, the case is based on documentary evidence and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required. Learned counsel has further referred to the order (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court, whereby the concession of anticipatory bail has been allowed to Ashok Kumar, co-accused and the case of the petitioner is on better footing.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of crime and had identified certain persons, on the basis of their Aadhar Cards. He further submits that Gurdev Singh, Vendor had already died and the sale deed was executed in favour of the complainant, just to cheat him. In the present case, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was a Deed Writer and had drafted the sale deed on the asking of the parties. Further, he had received the photocopies of Aadhar Cards from the parties and had accordingly drafted the sale deed. Thus, whether the petitioner shared the common intention with his co-accused or not, is a subject matter of trial and the prosecution is yet to lead evidence with regard to his involvement before the trial Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. At this stage, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required and the present petition is

allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

6. Pending application, if any, stands also disposed of.

07.07.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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