



107

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

**CRM-M-29845-2026
DECIDED ON: 22.05.2026**

SOM NATH MEHTA**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Ms. Supriya Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. **Present 3rd petition** has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.146, dated 27.07.2024, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC (corresponding to sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023), registered at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.

2. FIR in the present case was registered on 27.07.2024 alleging that petitioner, along with other co-accused, forged the signatures of the original members of the society in order to fabricate resolutions and resignation letters. These forged documents were subsequently presented before Registrar of Societies, Mansa, with the intent to usurp the property of the society. Significantly, one of the forged documents purportedly bears the signature of a member who had passed away in the year 2022, rendering it impossible for him to have signed any document in 2024. On the basis of these fabricated resolutions, a bank

account was allegedly opened with ICICI Bank, resulting in misappropriation of crores of rupees.

3. Broadly, the allegations against the petitioner are that he manipulated the composition of the society by expelling original members through forged resignations and replacing them with his own family members and close associates. In view of the serious nature of the allegations contained in the FIR, the first anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner, i.e. CRM-M-48186-2024, was dismissed by the then Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 29.01.2025 (Annexure P-16).

4. Thereafter, petitioner filed a second anticipatory bail petition, i.e. CRM-M-34483-2025 (Annexure P-17), which too was dismissed, vide order dated 09.07.2025, while taking note of the earlier dismissal order (Annexure P-16).

5. Present, being the third anticipatory bail petition, has been filed merely on the assumption that certain changed circumstances have arisen, and on that basis, an attempt has been made to contend that present petition is maintainable.

6. Notice of motion.

7. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, learned Senior DAG, Punjab, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent-State, and Mr. Viren Jah, Advocate, and Ms. Shruti Mehta, Advocate, put an appearance on behalf of the complainant.

8. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that petitioner has acted irresponsibly and has treated the earlier dismissal orders passed by this Court in a casual manner.

It is further submitted that petitioner has never surrendered before the authorities or submitted himself to the process of law, and proceedings for declaring him a proclaimed offender are already underway.

9. Considering the totality of circumstances, this Court is of the view that repeated filing of the petitions on the same issue deserves to be deprecated, and an appropriate message must be conveyed in that regard. **Consequently, present petition is dismissed, being not maintainable.**

10. However, with a strict warning, it is clarified that in case, petitioner fails to submit himself to the process of law, within a period of two weeks from today, he shall be liable to deposit costs of Rs.50,000/- with the Gaushala (Cow Shed) Mandir and Trust Committee, Water Works Road, Mansa (Punjab).

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

22.05.2026

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>