



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-14085-2025
Decided on : 17.02.2026

Suresh Kumar Bajaj . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Depinder Virk, Advocate and
Ms. Isha Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab along with
Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Suresh Kumar Bajaj	123	19.11.2022	406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472 & 120-B of IPC	City Mullanpur	SAS Nagar

2. In instant case, FIR was registered against total five accused, namely, (i) Ajay Sehgal (Secretary of Indian Cooperative Society Building House), (ii) Rajesh Girdhar (Cashier of Society), (iii) Ashish Kamra (Vice President of Society), (iv) Suresh Kumar Bajaj (petitioner herein and President of Society), and (v) Manvender Singh (disputed documents alleged to have been notarized by him of said Society).

As per allegations in FIR, landowners and farmers made



complaint that accused persons have connived with each other and tried to get CLU of their land by preparing forged documents of landowners.

3. Contention of learned Senior Counsel for petitioner is that licence had been issued by Town & Country Planning Department of Punjab State, which was subsequently cancelled and resultantly, original owners continued to be in possession of land in question, without execution of any transfer or sale deed in favour of any person or Society.

Further argues that co-accused Ajay Sehgal, who was similarly situated, remained in custody for about 20 days and was granted regular bail by Court of learned JMIC, Kharar vide order dated 30.07.2024 (P-10), which on challenge was set aside by Court of learned ASJ, Mohali vide order dated 18.09.2024 (P-11).

Issue regarding legality of bail order dated 30.07.2024 (P-10) came up before this Court for consideration in CRM-M-48507-2024 (O&M), titled as "*Ajay Sehgal v. State of Punjab and others*", and order dated 18.09.2024 (P-11) passed in revisional jurisdiction was set aside, restoring bail order dated 30.07.2024 (P-10) passed by learned JMIC, Kharar.

4. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that so far as remaining accused are concerned, accused Rajesh Girdhar was declared innocent by investigating agency, another accused Ashish Kamra had expired prior to registration of FIR, whereas, last accused Manvender Singh was granted concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 29.10.2024 in CRM-M-49113-2024, titled as, "*Manvender Singh v. State of Punjab*", which now stands confirmed vide order dated 13.10.2025.



Thus, taking into consideration aforesaid facts, Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.03.2025 granted interim bail to petitioner, and said concession is continuing since then.

5. In the backdrop of aforesaid facts and circumstances, learned Senior Counsel submits that petitioner is an old-aged person of about 74 years, has already been subjected to custodial interrogation for sufficient period and has thus joined investigation also; therefore, any further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Even interim concession granted about 11 months ago has not been misused. Thus, prays for confirmation of interim bail order and allowing the present petition.

6. On other hand, learned State counsel submits that attempt was made to commit large-scale fraud with poor landowners/farmers, though it ultimately failed, and petitioner does not deserve concession of bail. It is admitted that licence was issued in the name of petitioner or Society, which was later cancelled by competent authority.

Therefore, at present, it cannot be alleged that petitioner or any other accused has any subsisting connection with land owned by original owners, which was subject matter of agreement to sell. Broadly speaking, said agreement to sell, if any, stands cancelled as a consequence of cancellation of licence. It is also informed that petitioner had resigned as President of Society in year 2019 (P-7).

7. Considering the circumstances in totality and taking note of the fact that remaining co-accused, namely Ajay Sehgal and Manvender Singh, are already on regular bail or anticipatory bail, and culpability of petitioner, if any, is yet to be determined by trial Court and that too, primarily on basis



of documentary evidence collected during investigation, I deem it appropriate to consider the prayer for bail.

Accordingly, interim order dated 20.03.2025 passed by Coordinate Bench is made **absolute**, and prayer for grant of regular bail to petitioner is **allowed**, subject to furnishing of bail/surety bonds to satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 17, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No