



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

101

CRM-M-55292-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 22.01.2025

Trident Ltd.

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Kashish Aggarwal, Advocate and
Mr. Raghav Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Malkiat Singh, DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 483(3) of BNNS, 2023, petitioner seeks cancellation of pre-arrest bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 19.03.2024 (Annexure P-5), on the ground that the respondent-accused in order to mislead the investigation, handed over the laptop, different from the one provided to him by the company.

2. Mr. Chadha, senior counsel appearing for the complainant-petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to order dated 18.01.2023 which reads as under:-

“Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh, submits that i-pad and laptop have been recovered and offence under Section 201 IPC has also been added subsequent to the registration of the FIR.



Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks adjournment to move an appropriate application for addition of offence under Section 201 IPC.

Learned Senior Counsel for the complainant has sought to dispute the fact of recovery of laptop and seeks adjournment to furnish affidavit of the complainant depicting the loss which has occurred to the complainant on account of alleged misuse of data which was stored in the laptop and which remained in the custody of the petitioner.

Adjourned to 24.05.2023.

Interim order to continue.”

3. Further refers to order dated 19.03.2024 whereby interim bail granted to the respondent-accused was made absolute. Reference is being made to para 5 which reads as under:-

“State counsel, on instructions from ASI Satnam Singh, submits that pursuant to order dated 25.01.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and has also handed over the laptop on 01.03.2024.”

4. On 07.11.2024, when the matter was initially taken, Mr. Chadha was put a specific query regarding furnishing of the details of the laptop provided by the company to the investigating agency. Pursuant thereto affidavit of Mr. Anubhav Nayyar dated 09.11.2024 has been filed. Para 2 thereof reads as under:-

“2. That although at the time of getting registered the FIR (Annexure P-1), details of the Laptop entrusted to respondent no. 2 at the time of his joining the petitioner Company were not furnished but the fact remains that the Laptop which respondent no. 2 got recovered on 01.03.2024 does not even belong to the petitioner Company as the same was never purchased by the petitioner Company. Still further, at the time of effecting recovery of the said Laptop from respondent no. 2



on 01.03.2024, no efforts whatsoever were made by the Investigating Officer to make join the complainant for the purposes of getting identified the said Laptop.”

5. After going through the records of the case, in the considered opinion of this Court, there is nothing on record to show as to how the laptop as claimed by the complainant can be identified to record a satisfaction that the accused tried to mislead the investigating agency by providing laptop different than one which was provided by the company.

6. In view thereof, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition and the same is ordered to be dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

22.01.2025
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No