

2026:PHHC:087189



112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33435-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

ANUJ SETH AND ANR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ankur Bansal , Advocate for the petitioner(s)
Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under section 482 of the of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 438 of Cr.P.C) praying for grant of Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners in FIR no. 60 Dated 16.03.2026 under section 305, 316 (2), 316 (5), 336 (2), 336 (3), 338, 340 (2), 61 (2) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 380, 406, 409, 465, 467, 470, 120-B of Indian Penal Code) at P.S Division no.6, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and for grant of Interim Bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the present petition.

2. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present FIR is a counter blast to the petition filed by the petitioner under Section 379 of BNSS, 2023

against the daughter of the complainant. He further contends that the amount in question i.e. Rs. 18,54,890/- is shown in Income Tax Return as given by his wife as unsecured loan. It is his further contention that the present case is based on documentary evidence which is already in the possession of the investigating agency and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioners as such their custodial interrogation is not required at this stage.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State.

He opposes the petition for bail stating that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are found to be grave and serious in nature and to unearth the truth, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required.

3. **Analysis**

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court finds that the dispute pertains to a financial transaction, the details whereof are reflected in documentary records. The petitioner has placed reliance upon the Income Tax Return to contend that the amount in question was disclosed as an unsecured loan. The case appears to be based on documentary evidence which is already stated to be in the possession of the investigating agency. No specific recovery is shown to be pending from the petitioner and custodial interrogation does not appear necessary at this stage for the purpose of investigation.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioners, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and are ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for

furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to their joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

10.06.2026

anuradha

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

:Yes/No

:Yes/No