



CRM-M-63089-2025 and CRM-M-68500-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

231

CRM-M-63089-2025
Date of decision: 22.01.2026

SUMANT BATRA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

...RESPONDENTS

231-2

CRM-M-68500-2025

AMAN BATRA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rohit Sud, Advocate with
Ms. Kuljeet Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Sameesh Bassi, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-63089-2025.

Mr. Pardeep Singh Poonia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Yudhveer Hooda, Advocate and
Mr. Dharam Pal Sainin, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-68500-2025.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

None for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. In the above mentioned petitions common question of law and facts are involved, so both the petitions are being disposed of by a common judgment. For brevity, facts are being taken from CRM-M-63089-2025 titled as “*Sumant Batra*



2. Petitioner(s) have approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.146 dated 03.04.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala, Haryana.

3. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Gagandeep Singh. It was alleged that the complainant was the Director of M/s Gagan Coal Pvt. Ltd, the company which was engaged in business of selling petroleum coal. The accused 2 to 7 in the FIR, out of which, the petitioners are accused No.2 and 3, came to his office in Ambala and claimed them to be working as Directors of their company. They intended to purchase goods from their firm and assured that they would make prompt after purchasing the goods. The complainant firm started supplying the goods to the accused. However, after receiving the goods, they started defaulting in making the payment in fraudulent and deceitful manner. Thus, the outstanding amount of Rs.1,30,09,142 was not paid by the accused after the purchase of goods. The complainant on time and again made request to the accused but on one pretext of the other, the same was put off. Thus, it was alleged that the complainant realized that they have been cheated by all of the accused in conspiracy with each other. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioners surfaced and they were arrested on 25.02.2025 and 08.04.2025. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner(s) approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the



same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala declined the bail application vide orders dated 09.10.2025 and 27.10.2025, respectively. Thus, the petitioner(s) are before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that the petitioner(s) have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He further submits that from the bare perusal of the allegations made in the FIR, it is apparent that the dispute if at all is purely of a civil nature. Both the sides are admittedly are involved in business and dispute is regarding the payment of the goods purchased by the petitioner(s). He further submits that the complainant has already initiated the proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act against the petitioner(s) and the same is pending adjudication. He further submits that the company of the petitioner(s) is already liquidated and IRP has already been appointed by the learned NCLT. He further submits the complainant has an alternative remedy available under the relevant law, and that the FIR, in any event, is not maintainable. He further submits that the petitioner(s) are behind bars since 25.02.2025 and 08.04.2025. He further submits that petitioner, namely, Sumant Batra in CRM-M-63089-2025 is involved in 03 more cases, however, he is on bail in those cases whereas petitioner, namely, Aman Batra in CRM-M-68500-2025 is involved in 04 more cases, however, he is also on bail in those cases. He further submits that the petition for quashing of FIR is already pending adjudication before this Court. He further submits that the investigation is completed and charges have been framed. He further submits that the complainant has not appeared before the Court despite the issuance of non-bailable warrants against him. Thus, in the



facts and circumstances, the petitioner(s) deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the intention of the petitioner(s) is already found to be malafide from their conduct. During investigation, the complicity has been established, they have caused a huge loss to the complainant in conspiracy with each other. He further submits that petitioner, namely, Sumant Batra is involved in three more cases whereas petitioner, namely, Aman Batra is involved in four more cases but they both are on bail in those cases. He, on instructions, submits that investigation was completed and charges have been framed. Out of total 07 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined so far.

6. Heard.

7. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute primarily has alleged in the FIR is regarding the business transactions. As submitted before this Court that the litigation under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act is already pending between the parties. The investigation is already completed and charges have been framed. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner(s) have completed incarceration for 11 months. Out of 07 prosecution witnesses, only 01 has been examined so far.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the custody and the stage of the trial, this

**CRM-M-63089-2025 and CRM-M-68500-2025****-5-**

Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner(s) succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s). Accordingly, the present petition(s) are allowed. Petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the both the petitioner(s) during the period of 07 days from today, then their further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

22.01.2026

*renubala***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No