



117

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-74098-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 31.12.2025

ASHOK BABBAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Jaswinder Singh Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the complainant.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with FIR No. 370 dated 10.12.2025 under Sections 420 IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala.

2. Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that no cheating occurred, instead the parties had a business relationship involving ticket bookings.

The petitioner transferred Rs.2,63,000/- to the complainant and his relative Heena for ticket purchases. Further, to prove this fact, the petitioner has placed on record the account statement, UPI transactions screenshots, and ticket. It is alleged that the complainant fabricated allegations after a dispute arose, hence the present FIR.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, Addl. AG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner has defrauded the complainant of Rs.6,15,000/- on account of sending him to Italy. Out of the said amount, Rs.15,000/- was paid through UPI and Rs.6,00,000/- in cash.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, there is a delay of more than 2 years in lodging the FIR. On perusal of FIR, it appears that there is a business transaction between the parties, supported by account statements and transaction records. Moreover, there is nothing on record to show that the complainant has paid the alleged amount to the petitioner for sending him abroad except the verbal allegations. The dispute appears to be civil/commercial in nature. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court deems it a fit case to exercise its power under Section 482 of BNSS.

Hence, the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his

satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

Pending application(s), if any shall disposed off, accordingly.

31.12.2025

Mohit Goyal

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No