



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-57390-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.11.2025

Santosh Chatterjee

....Petitioner

Versus

U.T. of Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate and
Ms. Natabrata Bhattacharya, Advocate (Through Hybrid Mode)
for the petitioner

Mr. Kanwal Pal Singh, Addl. P.P. for U.T. Chandigarh

Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.14 dated 07.06.2025, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Economic Offence Wing, District Chandigarh.

2. On 14.10.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and is not the vendor but a customer of the complainant company with whom it has entered into an agreement vide Annexure P-3. Thereupon between February to September of the year 2024, against the 11 invoices that are sought to be questioned, an amount of Rs.2,19,77,206/- has been paid by it and correspondingly material also stands received, thus the allegations of forging these does not arise. However, with regard to an amount of Rs.52,19,668/-, a complaint has been filed under Section 138 of N.I. Act by the complainant against the petitioner which is pending before the Court concerned. Further that, there is an unexplained and inordinate delay of 8-9 months in lodging the FIR. There is no evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged offences. He is not involved in any other case and is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency and will cooperate.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Kanwar Pal Singh,



Addl. P.P. UT Chandigarh. accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate appeared on behalf of complainant.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation on or before 27.10.2025. In the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, subject to compliance of conditions as enshrined under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, it is clarified that if the petitioner does not join and cooperate with the Investigating Agency as required by the Arresting/Investigating Officer, this interim order shall be deemed to have been vacated.

Adjourned to 26.11.2025. ”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.
4. Learned State counsel on instructions affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.
5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 14.10.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.
6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

26.11.2025
M.Kamra

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