



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

Decided on : 23.02.2026

1. CRM-M-67907-2025
VAKEEL CHAND . . . PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA . . . RESPONDENT(S)

2. CRM-M-70461-2025
KAPIL BHATTI . . . PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA . . . RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Varun Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-67907-2025).

Ms. Suresha Rani Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-70461-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by SI Inder Sain, P.S. City Sirsa.

Mr. Nigam K. Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-67907-2025 and CRM-M-70461-2025, as all these petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-67907-2025.
2. While hearing all these petitions on 03.12.2025 and 15.12.2025, respectively, following orders were passed by this Court:-

“CRM-M-67907-2025

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of	FIR	Date	Section(s)	Police	District
---------------	-----	------	------------	--------	----------



<i>Petitioner (s)</i>	<i>No.</i>			<i>Station</i>	
<i>Vakeel Chand, aged about 29 years</i>	<i>670</i>	<i>04.10.2023</i>	<i>408 of IPC</i>	<i>City Sirsa</i>	<i>Sirsa</i>

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of one Gangadhar, who is Supervisor at the Head Office of Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad. Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd. is operating in partnership with Amazon for delivery of parcels in District Sirsa, and any parcel that is rejected or not delivered, is returned to the company through Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd.*

3. *As per the allegations in the FIR, around 51 parcels valued at Rs.15,19,316/- were shown as undelivered and allegedly never reached back to Amazon through the said company. Complainant has stated that upon inquiry, it was revealed that employees namely Jitendra (Manager at Sirsa), Vakil Chand (Supervisor at Sirsa), Kuldeep (Driver), Rajesh (Driver), Kapil Bhatti (Driver), and Sandeep (Delivery Boy) were involved in misappropriation of the parcels, and had thereby, committed criminal breach of trust while working with the company.*

4. *Counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations lack substance and material, and petitioner has been falsely implicated to provide an escape route for the managerial officials.*

It is further argued that there is an undue delay in lodging the FIR after noticing the missing parcels, and though FIR was registered on 04.10.2023 naming the petitioner, yet, no evidence has been collected by the prosecution, till date. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner was never required, and even at this belated stage, if such custody is sought, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the Investigating Agency, provided he is protected from arrest.

5. *Additionally, it is submitted that co-accused Jitendra (Manager) and Sandeep (Delivery Boy) have already been granted regular bail by the Court below; therefore, on the ground of parity, petitioner also deserves the concession of anticipatory bail in the present case.*

6. *Notice of motion.*

7. *On advance notice, Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Nigam K. Bhardwaj, Advocate, puts an appearance on behalf of the complainant.*

8. *Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Inder Sain, submits that in fact, five mobile phones were recovered, which were switched on after a long interval. Upon examining the disclosure statements of the accused, it has emerged that petitioner and his associates are involved in the commission of the offence. However, learned State counsel prays for grant of some time to file a detailed status report in the matter.*

9. *Adjourned to 17.12.2025.*

10. *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.*

CRM-M-70461-2025

1. *Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory*



bail to the petitioners, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

<i>Name & age of Petitioner (s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Kapil Bhatti, aged about 32 years</i>	<i>670</i>	<i>04.10.2023</i>	<i>408 of IPC (Sections 120-B, 34 of IPC added later on)</i>	<i>City Sirsa</i>	<i>Sirsa</i>

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of one Gangadhar, who is Supervisor at the Head Office of Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad. Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd. is operating in partnership with Amazon for delivery of parcels in District Sirsa, and any parcel that is rejected or not delivered, is returned to the company through Radgo Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd.*

3. *As per the allegations in the FIR, around 51 parcels valued at Rs.15,19,316/- were shown as undelivered and allegedly never reached back to Amazon through the said company. Complainant has stated that upon inquiry, it was revealed that employees namely Jitendra (Manager at Sirsa), Vakil Chand (Supervisor at Sirsa), Kuldeep (Driver), Rajesh (Driver), Kapil Bhatti (Driver), and Sandeep (Delivery Boy) were involved in misappropriation of the parcels, and had thereby, committed criminal breach of trust while working with the company.*

4. *Counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations lack substance and material, and petitioner has been falsely implicated to provide an escape route for the managerial officials.*

It is further argued that there is an undue delay in lodging the FIR after noticing the missing parcels, and though FIR was registered on 04.10.2023 naming the petitioner, yet, no evidence has been collected by the prosecution, till date. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner was never required, and even at this belated stage, if such custody is sought, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the Investigating Agency, provided he is protected from arrest.

5. *Additionally, it is submitted that co-accused Jitendra (Manager) and Sandeep (Delivery Boy) have already been granted regular bail by the Court below; and co-accused namely Vakeel Chand, has also been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 03.12.2025, in CRM-M-67907-2025. Therefore, on the ground of parity, petitioner also deserves the concession of anticipatory bail in the present case.*

6. *Notice of motion.*

7. *On advance notice, Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Nigam K. Bhardwaj, Advocate, puts an appearance on behalf of the complainant.*

8. *Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Inder Sain, submits that in fact, five mobile phones were recovered, which were switched on after a long interval. Upon examining the disclosure statements of the accused, it has emerged that petitioner and his associates are involved in the commission of the offence. However, learned State counsel prays for grant of some time to file a detailed status report in the matter.*

9. *Adjourned to 17.12.2025.*

To be heard along with CRM-M-67907-2025.

10. *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(s) submits that the present case has been registered after a gap of two years, without there being any evidence with the prosecution to establish that the particular IMEI numbers of the mobile phones were ever assigned to the petitioners. It is contended that the relevant record would be in the possession of the complainant–Company and, in the absence of any such evidence, the petitioners cannot be treated as accused merely on the basis of allegations. Rather, petitioners have been made scapegoats by other responsible persons of the Company, who were actually responsible for the offence. It is further submitted that the petitioners are ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the common status report in both cases, in Court today. Same is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

Copies thereof have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

5. Learned State counsel is unable to produce any material before this Court to establish that the IMEI numbers of the mobile phones in question were assigned to either of the petitioners, namely, Vakeel Chand and Kapil Bhatti.

6. Heard.

7. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, and without expressing any opinion on the merits, the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners appears to be *prima facie* plausible.

Accordingly, petitioners are directed to join the investigation within a period of two weeks from today, or as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, they shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be



abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their respective passports to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possesses. 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, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. Accordingly, petitions stand **disposed of**.

10. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioners to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possesses, 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.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected case.

February 23, 2026
J.Ram

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No