



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

223

**CRM-M No.15694 of 2026
Date of decision : 18.5.2026
Date of uploading : 18.5.2026**

Sanjiv Bhalla @ Sanjeev BhallaPetitioner
Versus
State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. APS Rehan, Advocate, for the petitioner
Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.118 dated 6.12.2018 under Section 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'Complaint No. 5823-SSP Dt.28-9-18 The SSP Hoshairpur, Punjab. Sub: Complaint Against Sanjeev Kumar Bhalla Regarding Cheque Bounce & cheating and non payment of Money. Sir, with due respect this is to inform you that we have already given a complaint against Mr. Bhalla for the above subject. Now as per his last commitment to pay the amount, he did not pay the amount and again Misleading & Manipulating the things. So please initiate as per the law. Thanks & regards Sd:-Subhash Samitre 9888520613. Gist of the matter:- Complaint No. 5823-SSP dated 28-09-18 was filed by Subhash Samitre son of Kalipad Samitre, resident of Kama Tabar, Chandigarh road, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar,



against Sanjeev Kumar Bhalla son of Jang Bahadur Bhalla, resident of Fatehgarh Mohalla, House No. 339, Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur, presently residing at Rajpurbhaian, Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur, regarding cheating to the tune of Rs. 8,88,000/-. An inquiry into this matter was conducted by Shri Sukhwinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Special Branch, Hoshiarpur. During the course of the inquiry, Sanjeev Kumar Bhalla, son of Jang Bahadur Bhalla, resident of Fatehgarh Mohalla, House No. 339, Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur, presently residing at Rajpurbhaian, Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur was found culpable, and it was recommended to register a case against him under Section 420 of the IPC. Accordingly, as per the order No. 3355-PC dated 04-12-18 of the Hon'ble SSP, a case under Section 420 IPC has been registered against Sanjeev Kumar Bhalla, son of Jang Bahadur Bhalla, resident of Fatehgarh Mohalla, House No. 339, Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur, presently residing at Rajpurbhaian, Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur. The original complaint, along with the inquiry report and other documents (total pages 1 to 39) and a copy of the FIR, is being handed over to ASI Gurdial Singh, No. 179, Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur, for further investigation. Information is being conveyed to the Control Room via wireless. Compliance Report No. 14 dated 06-12-18 at 10:05 AM.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner was earlier afforded the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 9.1.2019 but could not appeared before the concerned Court due to miscommunication. In any case, the petitioner is in custody since 4.2.2026. Learned counsel has further urged that the petitioner is facing magisterial trail. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 15.5.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.



5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. It is not in dispute before this Court that presently the petitioner is in custody since 4.2.2026 and earlier afforded the concession of anticipatory bail by the concerned trial Court. But he did not appear before the concerned Court and declared proclaimed offender on 11.4.2023. However, keeping in view the factum that the trial in question is magisterial one, the petitioner is a man aged 51 years and now in custody since 4.2.2026, this Court is inclined to afford him the concession of regular bail.

6.1 As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in other FIR(s). Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal)*



191.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

In addition to other conditions, the petitioner shall be required either to furnish cash surety, bank guarantee or an FDR in the name of Court releasing him on bail to the tune of ₹50,000/-, which shall be liable to be forfeited, in case the petitioner could not appear before the concerned Court without plausible cause.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of

2026:PHHC:077705



CRM-M No.15694 of 2026

-5-

opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

18.5.2026
Ashwanii

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