



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

104

CRM-M-21492-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 01.05.2026

Navneet Saini

... Petitioner

Versus

Registrar of Companies, Punjab and Chandigarh

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Karanveer Sing Lall, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)**CRM-19132-2026**

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the hearing of the main petition is preponed from 14.05.2026 and the same is taken on Board today itself.

CRM-M-21492-2026

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in complaint case bearing No.COMA-2-2025 dated 10.01.2025, registered under Sections 448 read with Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013, pending before learned Court of Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted the present petitioner has been summoned to face trial for the offence punishable under Sections 448 read with Section 447 of the Companies Act, 2013 pending



CRM-M-21492-2026 (O&M) (2)

before learned Court of Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, Mohali; the petitioner is ready to face trial but has apprehension that he will be taken into custody and will be sent behind bars. Faced with this situation, the petitioner filed an application seeking anticipatory bail before the Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, Mohali, however, the same was dismissed vide order 01.04.2026. Hence, prayer is made that he may be granted the relief of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Gurneet Sagoo, Advocate, accepted notice on behalf of the respondent–UOI (Registrar of Companies) and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that in the present case, the petitioner has only been summoned to face trial, and no arrest warrants have been issued against the present petitioner. Hence, in view of the same, the present petition is not maintainable, and sought dismissal thereof.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is disposed of and the petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court and move an application before it. The trial Court shall decide his application in view of ratio of law laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Tarsem Lal vs. Director of Enforcement Jalandhar Zonal Office, 2024 INSC 434*.

01.05.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No