



108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50544-2025
DECIDED ON: 09.03.2026

RAVNEET SINGH SANDHU @ MANVEER SINGH
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

UT OF CHANDIGARH AND ANR
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Jashan Mehta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Balram Singh, Addl. PP, UT, Chandigarh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.0142, dated 04.09.2024, under Section(s) 409, 420, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station South Sector-34, Chandigarh.

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 09.09.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. Counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that FIR in question was registered on 04.09.2024. However, as per the reply dated 03.07.2025 filed by the Investigating Officer of Police Station 34, UT, Chandigarh, Bank Account No. 100142275707 of IndusInd Bank was found to be in the name of one Jatin Hans, details of which are yet to be verified. Furthermore, the rent deed in question is stated to be in the name of one Harinder Singh, son of Faman Singh, resident of House No. 351, Ward No. 1, Mundi Kharar, SAS Nagar (Mohali). Despite this, the said accused has

not been arrested till date, whereas prosecution is seeking custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

3. *Further submits that petitioner is merely an employee in the said company/firm and has no active participation in its management or functioning. It is, therefore, contended that petitioner cannot be held responsible for allegedly duping the complainant of an amount of Rs.15 lakhs, as alleged in the impugned FIR. However, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Balram Singh, Addl, PP, UT, Chandigarh, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State.*

6. *List again on 19.09.2025.*

To be shown in the urgent list.

7. *The Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Chandigarh is directed to examine the matter and ascertain the reasons, as to why the person who had taken the property in question on rent has not been arrested, till date.*

8. *Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel."*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that dispute between the parties has now been amicably settled. It is submitted that the entire settled amount of Rs.6 lakhs has already been paid by the petitioner to respondent No.2/complainant. Thus, once the monetary dispute stands resolved, subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation would be too harsh.

He further submits that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the investigating agency, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Balkar Singh, expresses his ignorance regarding the alleged amicable settlement between the parties.

5. Mr. Maan Akashdeep Singh, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant and files his *vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. The office is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place in the case file.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant endorses the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that monetary dispute between the parties has already been resolved, and the entire settled amount of Rs.6 lacs has been received by the complainant from the petitioner.

7. In view of the stand taken by learned counsel for the respective parties, this Court does not find any substantial reason to keep the present petition pending or to subject the petitioner for custodial interrogation. Hence, present petition is **allowed**.

8. Petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

09.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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