IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.217

CRM-M-20168-2026
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

TALJINDER SINGH @ CASHIER TALJINDER SINGH ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Jasmeet Singh Bhatia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab.

*****

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 106 dated 19.07.2025, registered at Police Station Qadian, District Batala, for the offence punishable under Section 409 IPC (corresponding to Section 316 BNS).

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR came to be registered on the complaint of Gurmeet Singh, who alleged that he was maintaining a savings bank account in Bank of Baroda and an amount of approximately Rs.30 lakhs was lying deposited therein. It has been alleged that during the year 2024, without the consent or knowledge of the complainant, the mobile number linked with his bank account was changed/closed and different amounts were fraudulently transferred from his account by the present petitioner, who was working as Cashier in the said bank. As per the allegations, an amount of Rs.4 lakhs was transferred to the account of the

father of the petitioner namely Baldev Singh on 06.11.2024, another amount of Rs.11 lakhs was transferred on 11.11.2024 and further amounts were also transferred to the accounts of co-accused/co-workers namely Deep Mattu, Ashwani Kumar, Ankit Goyal and Mandeep Kaur. In this manner, an amount to the tune of about Rs.30 lakhs is alleged to have been misappropriated from the account of the complainant, whereupon the present FIR was registered against the petitioner and other co-accused persons.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.08.2025 and has already suffered incarceration for about eight months and six days. It is further submitted that the trial is still at the initial stage, as out of 80 prosecution witnesses, none has yet been examined, and the case is based mainly on documentary evidence already forming part of the challan. It is, thus, argued that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period. Learned counsel has also contended that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are vague, false and fictitious, and that he has been made a scapegoat in the present case. It has been further stated that the petitioner is a young person, the sole breadwinner of the family, having responsibility to maintain his aged parents and wife, and he is a permanent resident of Gurdaspur with deep roots in society. It is also contended that no other FIR is pending against him, he has not been declared a proclaimed offender, no proclamation proceedings are pending, and he undertakes to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Hon’ble Court.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in a

serious economic offence involving misappropriation of a huge amount from the accounts of innocent bank customers. It has been argued that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature and specifically attribute to him the manipulation of banking records and unauthorized transfer of amounts from the accounts of various account holders to the accounts of his relatives and co-accused persons. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the challan/final report already stands presented, charges have been framed and as many as 80 prosecution witnesses are cited in the case, out of whom material witnesses are yet to be examined. It is further contended that in case the petitioner is enlarged on bail at this stage, there is every likelihood of influencing or intimidating the witnesses and tampering with the prosecution evidence, particularly when the case pertains to documentary and banking transactions. However, it is not disputed that no other criminal case is stated to be pending against the petitioner.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and pertain to misappropriation of substantial amounts from the bank accounts of innocent customers by allegedly abusing his position as a bank official. The prosecution has specifically alleged unauthorized transfer of funds to the accounts of relatives/co-accused persons and the matter involves examination of banking records and testimony of material witnesses, who are yet to be examined before the trial Court. Merely because the petitioner has remained in custody for about nine months would not, by itself, entitle him to the concession of regular bail,

particularly in view of the seriousness and magnitude of the allegations.

6. In such circumstances, this Court does not find any ground to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

7. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

8. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
Anu

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