



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-58234-2025

AMIT ANAND

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-58238-2025

MANOJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

Decided on: 09.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Arpandeeep Narula, Advocate, and
Mr. Piyush Mittal, Advocate,
for the petitioners (in both the cases).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagdeep Singh Bajwa, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition(s) have been filed by petitioners Amit Anand and Manoj Kumar, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 163 dated 12.09.2025, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar.
2. On 15.10.2025, following order was passed:-



"1. Both the aforementioned petitions are being taken up together, and the facts are being noticed from CRM-M-58234-2025.

2. Present petition(s) have been filed by petitioners Amit Anand and Manoj Kumar, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 163 dated 12.09.2025, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar.

3. Petitioner Amit Anand is employed as a Regional Sales Manager, and Petitioner Manoj Kumar is employed as a Regional Credit Manager at Cholamandalam Investment and Finance Company Ltd., Jalandhar. The complainant, Rampal Arora, and his wife, Sunita Arora, have registered the instant FIR against Rajiv Arora (the complainant's real nephew) and other co-accused, namely Rahul Verma and Ashish Gulati (both function as selling agents to facilitate the passing of the loan), as well as employees of the local branch office of Cholamandalam Investment and Finance Company Ltd. at Amritsar, namely Bhupinder, Raj Kumar, and Manpreet.

4. As per the allegations, there were a total of four registered sale deeds in the names of the complainant, Rampal Arora, his wife, Sunita Arora, his brother, Ram Narayan Arora, and his wife, Krishna, pertaining to properties measuring 220 Sq. Yards each. The admitted position mentioned in the FIR is that, owing to strong family belief, all the four sale deeds were lying in possession of the elder brother, Ram Narayan Arora, and his wife, Krishna.

5. The allegations in the FIR state that Rajiv Arora, S/o Ram Narayan Arora, stole the four registered sale deeds from his father's possession and mortgaged them to obtain a loan of Rs.2.5 Crores and a top-up loan of Rs.1.40 Crore.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) argues that the main accused, Rajiv Arora, and all other family members reside in Amritsar, and the properties to which the said sale deeds pertain are also situated in Amritsar. Rajiv Arora, who allegedly forged the signatures of all eight family members, completed all documentary work at the Amritsar office after contacting the other co-accused, namely Rahul Verma and Ashish Gulati (agents to facilitate the loan). However, due to the sanctioning limit of only Rs.30 Lakhs at the Amritsar office, the file was moved further from the Amritsar office to the Head Office/Regional Office of Cholamandalam at



Jalandhar, where the above mentioned petitioners are employed.

7. *Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further argues that after receiving the file at Jalandhar office, it got processed through the tables of both the petitioners and was finally approved by the State Regional Credit Manager, Jalandhar (SRCM)-Mr. Sukhbir Singh, who has not even been made an accused.*

8. *Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) also submits that, in view of the position explained above, and considering that all documentary work, including the signing, attestation of documents, and execution of affidavits, was, in all probability, accomplished at the initial stage in Amritsar, the file was moved to the Jalandhar Head Office only for sanctioning purposes due to Rs.30 Lakh loan limit. Therefore, there was no reason for the petitioners, or any other official working in the Chola mandalam office in Jalandhar, to doubt the veracity or signatures on the documents, or the identity of the loan seekers.*

9. *Counsel further argues that even with the greatest stretch of imagination, it cannot be assumed that both the petitioners connived with Rajiv Arora at the time of stealing the sale deeds.*

10. *Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) also refers to the inquiry report discussed in the impugned order dated 04.10.2025(P-10) by which bail was dismissed by the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar. The report specifically mentions that both the petitioners never got the loan documents signed from the applicants/co-applicants in their presence, but it notes that their officials did not discharge their duties properly as they failed to verify whether the complainant or his wife had actually signed those loan documents.*

11. *Referring to the aforementioned part of the inquiry report, Mr. Arpandeep Narula, Advocate, argues that there was no situation to raise doubt for the petitioners, or for any official sitting in a different city (i.e., Jalandhar), that any fault or fraud had been committed at the inception of the loan application by the officials sitting at the Amritsar office.*

12. *Explaining all the aforementioned points, counsel for the petitioner submits that, moreover, the allegations are to be proved by the prosecution solely through documentary evidence, and custodial interrogation would not be required for the same. For*



this purpose, petitioners are ready to join the investigation, provided they are protected from arrest.

13. Notice of motion.

14. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report.

15. Adjourned to 03.12.2025.

16. In the meanwhile, petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Petitioners shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

17. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

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

18. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of the order dated 15.10.2025, passed by this Court, petitioners have joined the investigation, and have fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioners of joining the investigation by the petitioners, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioners have already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated



15.10.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, both the petitions stand disposed of.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioners to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, they would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO