

2026:PHHC:030143

112 (1st case)**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-45239-2022 (O&M)

Dr. Jayant Chawla and another

....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

Date of Decision: February 25, 2026

Date of Uploading: February 25, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**Present:** Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG Punjab

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

The substantive prayer made in the petition in hand reads thus:

“In view of the facts and submissions made above, it is, therefore, respectfully prayed that the present petition may kindly be accepted and the petitioner may kindly be granted concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in complaint case (P-7) bearing No.COMA-4 of 2022 dated 12.07.2022, under Section 447 of the Companies Act.”

2. On 29.09.2022, the following order was passed:

“Through the instant petition, the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in complaint case bearing No.COMA-4-2022 dated 12.07.2022, under Section 447 of the Companies Act.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are renowned Doctors and there is an inter-se dispute between three sets of working Directors and that as per the enquiry report dated 28.04.2022, the alleged amount was withdrawn through voucher and all the directors were held responsible for the same, without resolution.

Notice of motion for 19.10.2022.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

The trial Court is directed to adjourn the case beyond the date fixed before this Court.”

3. The aforesaid order is enuring till date. There is no allegation of misuse of the said interim relief granted to the petitioners.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are willing to join complaint proceedings, in accordance with law, and face complaint proceedings.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.2, while raising submissions in tandem with written reply dated 28.03.2023 filed on behalf of respondent No.2, has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners by iterating that there are grave/ serious allegations against the petitioners, and hence, they ought not to be extended concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the fact that the case in hand emanates from criminal complaint, the petitioners are extended an interim relief, on 29.09.2022, which is enuring till date, the petitioners expressing their willingness to appear before the concerned Court and face proceedings, in accordance with law; this Court is inclined to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. *Ergo*, the petition in hand is **allowed**; the petitioners are extended the concession of anticipatory bail, subject to their appearing before the concerned Court and furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the said Court. The petitioners shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 438 (2) of Cr. P.C. Needless to say that the petitioners shall appear regularly before the concerned Court.

8. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be

confined to the complaint case mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

9. Liberty is reserved in favour of the respondent/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 438 (2) of Cr. P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
10. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 25, 2026

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No