



CGHC010252432021



2026:CGHC:28128

**NAFR****HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRMP No. 1020 of 2021**

Bank Of Baroda Through Senior Branch Manager (Arvind Kumar Banjara), Rajkishore Nagar Branch, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**--- Petitioner(s)****versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Sarkanda, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**--- Respondent(s)****CRMP No. 1041 of 2021**

Bank Of Baroda Through Senior Branch Manager (Arvind Kumar Banjara), Rajkishore Nagar Branch, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

**---Petitioner(s)****Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Tarbahar, Bilaspur District Bilaspur (C.G.)

**--- Respondent(s)**

**CRMP No. 1030 of 2021**

Bank Of Baroda Through Senior Branch Manager (Arvind Kumar Banjara), Rajkishore Nagar Branch, Seepat Road, Bilaspur , District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Sarkanda, Bilaspur , District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

---

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Punit Ruparel, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. S.S. Baghel, G.A.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**  
**Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge**  
**Judgment on Board**

**Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**

**08.07.2026**

1. Heard Mr. Punit Ruparel, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. S.S. Baghel, learned Government Advocate for respondent / State.
2. The petitioner has filed CRMP No. 1020/2021 praying for following relief:-

*“The petitioner therefore most humbly and respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and issue direction to the Trial Court / Police to release seized loan*

*account of Pavitra Sikka and Nini Sikka Mortgage Loan Account No. 32220400000147 total 9 documents and Firm M/s. Bilaspur Casting Industries Cash Credit Limit (C.C. Limit) Loan Account No. 322200000162 total 16 loan documents during the course of investigation in Crime No. 816/2019 in offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC on Supurdnama / interim custody to the petitioner and further set-aside the order passed by courts below, in the interest of justice.”*

3. The petitioner has filed CRMP No. 1030/2021 praying for following relief:-

*“The petitioner therefore most humbly and respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and issue direction to the Trial Court / Police to release seized Aditya Culture's Cash Credit Limit (C.C. Limit) Loan Account No. 32220500000025 and 8 other documents seized during the course of investigation in Crime No. 567/2019 in offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of IPC on Supurdnama / interim custody to the petitioner and further set-aside the order passed by courts below, in the interest of justice.”*

4. The petitioner has filed CRMP No. 1041/2021 praying for following relief:-

*“The petitioner therefore most humbly and respectfully prays that the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and issue direction*

*to the Trial Court / Police to release seized loan account of M/s. Unique Creation Loan Account No. 32220500000033 complete document, Pappu Vijay Kumar, K. M/s. Bilaspur Metalics Loan Account No. 32220500000028 and its complete documents, Royal Fabricate Proprietor Arun Kumar Sahu, Loan Account No. 32220400000156 and its complete documents, Start-up Engineer Partner Fajle Rasul and Sujata Manek Loan Account No. 32220500000013 and its complete documents seized during the course of investigation in Crime No. 245/2019 in offence punishable under Section 420 & 34 of IPC on Supurdnama / interim custody to the petitioner and further set-aside the order passed by courts below, in the interest of justice.”*

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are the lawful custodians of the seized loan account files and connected banking documents, which were taken into possession by the investigating agency during investigation of the respective crimes. It is argued that the original loan documents are required by the petitioners for the purpose of recovery proceedings, enforcement of security interest, maintenance of banking records and other statutory functions. It is further submitted that the continued retention of the original documents by the investigating agency serves no useful purpose as the investigation has substantially progressed and certified copies of the documents are sufficient for the purposes of trial. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners are ready and willing to furnish an

undertaking to produce the original documents as and when directed by the trial Court or the Investigating Agency. It is, therefore, prayed that the impugned orders rejecting the applications for interim custody be set aside and the seized documents be released on Supurdnama, subject to appropriate conditions.

6. Per contra, learned Government Advocate appearing for the State opposes the petitions and submits that the seized loan account files and original documents constitute material evidence in the respective criminal cases involving offences of cheating, forgery and conspiracy. It is submitted that the authenticity, execution and contents of the original documents are likely to be examined during trial and their custody with the prosecution is necessary to preserve the evidentiary value of the documents. It is further contended that the trial Court has rightly declined the prayer for interim release after considering the nature of the offences and the necessity of preserving the original records. Hence, according to the State, no interference is warranted in exercise of the inherent jurisdiction of this Court.
7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents brought on record.
8. Considering the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the record, this Court finds no illegality, impropriety or perversity in the orders passed by the learned trial Court. The original loan account documents

constitute material documentary evidence in the pending criminal proceedings and their continued custody is necessary for the purposes of investigation and trial. The Trial Court has rightly rejected the applications for interim release after assigning cogent reasons.

9. Accordingly, the petitions stands **dismissed**, with liberty to the petitioners to take recourse to law.

Sd/-  
**(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)**  
Judge

Sd/-  
**(Ramesh Sinha)**  
Chief Justice

**Manpreet**