



226

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M No.63319 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.02.2026

Satwinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Gurvinder S. Sandhu, Advocate and
Mr. Gagandeep S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.248 dated 01.12.2021, under Sections 408, 420, 120-B of the IPC, registered at Police Station Sahnewal, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ravinder Gupta, General Manager, M/s Grover Automobiles Private Limited, Ludhiana. It was alleged that M/s Grover Automobiles Private Limited deals in sale of cars manufactured by Hyundai in which Satwinder Singh (petitioner) was an employee, who used to deal with customers and used to prepare their files and look after documentation. About 10 days back, it was brought to the notice of the complainant that although a car had been sold by way of



financing but the factum of hypothecation was not mentioned in the Registration Certificate of the sold vehicle. Upon being confronted, Satwinder Singh Mander stated that it was on account of inadvertence. Upon the complainant made further inquiries, it was revealed that even on earlier occasions also there had been omission to mention the factum of hypothecation in the Registration Certificates of the vehicle being sold. It was alleged that Satwinder Singh Mander intentionally did not get the said factum of hypothecation recorded in the Registration Certificate of vehicles with *mala fide* intentions. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. Thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 12.08.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 09.10.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He has submitted that the petitioner was working as a Salesman in the dealership namely, M/s Grover Automobiles Private Limited from the year 2015 to 2018. He has further submitted that the petitioner was assigned the duty of selling vehicles only and had no role in registration of vehicle, details of loan or hypothecation etc. as the same



were dealt by the Accounts Department. He has submitted that the alleged forms of Registration Certificates of vehicles were neither signed by the present petitioner nor sent by him to the Office of Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana and the duty of the petitioner was only to show new vehicles available for sale in the showroom to the customers. He submits that all the negotiations regarding the price of new vehicles were fixed by the General Manager i.e. Complainant of the Company and all other paper work was done by other staff working under the guidance of the General Manager. He has submitted that after registration of the present FIR, the petitioner approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail by filing CRM-M-3603-2022 and was granted interim bail vide order dated 23.02.2022 and thereafter, vide order dated 25.07.2022, his anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court. He submits that petitioner was arrested on 12.08.2025 and since then he is behind the bars. To buttress his arguments, he has submitted that co-accused namely, Raj Kumar @ Raju was arrested in the present FIR however, he has been granted regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide order dated 18.02.2025. He thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that apart from looking after the customers who used to visit the car agency to make queries or to purchase car, the petitioner also used



to assist in the matter of documentation for the purpose of sending documents to the office of the Registering Authority. He submits that the petitioner in connivance with co-accused, helped the customers in getting the Registration Certificates without mentioning the factum of hypothecation of the said vehicles sold on their Registration Certificates. He submits that during the course of investigation, particulars of various cars which had been sold in dubious manner had been collected, which clearly establishes the complicity of the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner has misused the concession of anticipatory bail granted to him vide order dated 23.02.2022 in CRM-M-3603-2022 and hence, declared as proclaimed offender on 17.05.2025. He, on instructions, submits that challan has been filed, charges have been framed and out of 19 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. She thus, submits that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was named in the FIR. There are allegations that the petitioner dealt directly with the customers for purchasing the vehicles on behalf of the company and prepared their files after completion of the documents. It is claimed that the petitioner deliberately did not mention the fact of hypothecation on their Registration Certificate so as to able to extend undue benefit to the purchasers who could thereafter sell off the vehicles without having paid full price for the same. As submitted the petitioner was granted

anticipatory bail by this Court but as the petitioner misused the same, he was declared as proclaimed offender on 17.05.2025 and thereafter, was arrested on 12.08.2025. As submitted, challan has been presented, charges are framed and out of 19 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

6. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail, at this stage. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.02.2026	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
<i>m.sharma</i>	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No