101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7883-2025
DECIDED ON: 23.03.2026

PANKAJ KHURANA **.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB **.....RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagpal Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. A.S. Sivia, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.186, dated 15.11.2024, under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Moti Nagar, District Ludhiana.

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 11.02.2025, following order was passed:-

> *"2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that FIR has been complainant in the FIR is M/s Patanjali Parivahan Pvt. Ltd. and the petitioner is merely working in the company as its employee since the year 2019. He has no connection as beneficiary with the amount, which is allegedly transferred from the complainant – Company's account to 4/5 other companies account i.e. (i)* ***S.S. Foods Industries***

[(payment made accused No.3 through bank account) Rs.1,72,92,960.00 bogus payment received (through account) -67,02,627.00 -Fraud amount – Rs.1,05,90,333.00], (ii) **Devyani International Ltd.** *[(payment made accused No.3 through bank account) 1,49,75,000.00-Bogus payment received (through account)-40,13,099.00-Fraud amount - 1,09,61,901.00],* **(iii) Vardhman yarns and Threads Ltd.** *- [Bogus transaction amount (payment made accused No.3 through bank account) 38,74,023.00-Fraud amount – 38,74,023.00],* **(iv) Medico Hosiery Works** *– [Bogus transaction amount (payment made accused No.3 through bank account) 17,74,814.00-Fraud amount -17,74,814.00], (***v) Doors and Beyond** *– [Bogus transaction amount (payment made accused No.3 through bank account) 24,87,520.00 -Bogus payment received (through account) -15,50,440.00 -Fraud amount-9,37,080.00], and* **(vi) MRS Bector Foods Speciality Limited** *-[Bogus transaction amount (payment made accused No.3 through bank account) 6,03,680.00 -Fraud amount -6,03,680.00].*

Besides, counsel submits that the co-accused namely; Jagpreet Singh's bail petition i.e. CRM-M-64960-2024, is pending consideration before this Court for 17.02.2025.

3. Counsel for the petitioner produces the copy of order dated 23.12.2024, passed in CRM-M-64960-2024 in Court, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. The operative part of the order dated 23.12.2024, is reproduced as under:-

> *"1. Present petition has been filed by the accused – Jagpreet Singh, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0186 dated 15.11.2024 registered under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Moti Nagar, District Ludhiana.*
>
> *2. Counsel for the petitioner, inter alia contends that the amount of about Rs.4 crores paid by the complainant-company which is allegedly embezzeled has never been credited to the amount of the petitioner. The sole beneficiaries are employees of the complainant-company, who are accused Nos.1 and 2 in the present FIR. They had opened the forged accounts in the name of the different firms, to which the amount has been credited, and the accused Nos.1 and 2 were using those accounts.*
>
> *3. Notice of motion.*

4. On advance notice, Mr. S.S. Gill, Sr. DAG-cum-Public Prosecutor, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State along with the Investigating Officer.

5. Mr. Arshdeep Singh Sivia, Advocate, puts in appearance, and files his memorandum of appearance in Court today, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

6. Adjourned to 14.01.2025.

7. In the meanwhile, learned State shall file status report in the matter."

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report.

6. Adjourned to 17.02.2025.

In the meanwhile, learned State counsel shall file status report in the matter.

To be heard along with CRM-M-64960-2024."

3. Today, learned State counsel informs that the connected petition, i.e., CRM-M-64960-2024, already stands disposed of, as having been withdrawn by the petitioner therein.

4. Paragraph Nos.7 and 8 of the status report dated 15.02.2025, appended with the present petition, provide complete details regarding the amounts transferred to the bank account of the petitioner by the other co-accused. For reference, same are reproduced hereunder:-

"7. That the present petitioner along with co-accused Ankush Grover being the employees of the Patanjali Parivahan Company had operated multiple bank accounts under the names of fictitious firms, such as M/s Indian Road Corporation and M/s Mega Star, to receive the funds. The investigation confirmed that a total of Rs.4,10,07,997 was transferred to these accounts which have been operated by the co-accused Jagpreet Singh.

8. That it is relevant to mention here that the portion of the misappropriated amount, totaling

> *Rs.2,07,61,898, was refunded by co-accused Jagpreet Singh to the account of the complainant company.* ***The remaining amount was distributed among the co-accused viz. Rs.52,11,546 to petitioner Pankaj Khurana,*** *Rs. 80,42,241 to co-accused Ankush Grover, and Rs.69,87,312 retained by the co-accused Jagpreet Singh petitioner. In this way, role of petitioner is proved."*

5. Further, in paragraph Nos.9 and 10 of the status report, details have been provided in tabulated form, regarding the fake bills allegedly generated by the accused persons, including the petitioner, amounting to Rs.4,10,07,997/-.

6. In view of the factual matrix, nature of allegations, and involvement of the petitioner as detailed in the status report, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. **Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.**

7. It is, however, observed that FIR in the present case was registered on 15.11.2024, and as informed by learned State counsel, the concerned Investigating Officer has, till date, failed to secure the arrest of the petitioner.

8. *Prima facie*, it appears that the concerned police officer has not shown due diligence in the discharge of his/her official duties.

9. Accordingly, the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, is directed to examine the matter and ascertain whether, despite registration of the FIR on 15.11.2024 and lapse of considerable time thereafter, and in the absence of any interim protection granted by this Court during the pendency of the present petition, the Investigating Officer has taken all necessary steps in accordance with law, and in case, any lapse or

negligence is found, appropriate action shall be taken against the erring officer, in accordance with law.

10. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

23.03.2026
Lavisha

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