



CRM-M-66960-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-66960-2025

Date of decision: 10.12.2025

BINISH OHRI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Complainant in person.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

1.           Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.072 dated 04.09.2023 under Sections 420, 408, 465, 467, 468, 471, 474, 201 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Kathgarh, District SBS Nagar.

2.           Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement complaint of Avinash Kumar Singh, in which it was alleged that he started a factory under the name and style of Aasma Export India for manufacturing of plywood, flash door and block board etc. in village Bharthala, Police Station Kathgarh, Tehsil Balachaur, District SBS Nagar. However, he remained busy during the year 2023 and started residing at Chandigarh and due to his engagement in his personal work, household activities and social welfare activities, he hardly used to visit his factory and due to his non-visitation in the factory, his trustworthy workers, in connivance with each other, misappropriated crores of rupees. In his complaint, he mainly named Deepak

**CRM-M-66960-2025****-2-**

Kumar, Sabir Ali, Santosh Kumar Mishra, Munna Kumar, Utpal Das, Bhola and Chiranjeet and accused all of them for the alleged embezzlement of funds of the factory. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. The FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was named by his co-accused and was arrested on 30.07.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 10.09.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Satish Kumar Ohri. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 10.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-53821-2025, whereby, co-accused Satish Kumar Ohri has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 30.07.2025. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Satish Kumar Ohri. On instructions, he has submitted that investigation is complete and the challan has already been presented in the Court on 28.10.2025. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

**CRM-M-66960-2025****-3-**

and has vehemently opposed the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 30.07.2025. Co-accused, namely, Satish Kumar Ohri is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner has completed incarceration of 03 months and 27 days and he is not involved in any other case.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.12.2025  
*renubala*

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

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