



101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34430-2025

Date of Decision :15.09.2025

Muneesh Narula

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Akhil Godara, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chanchal K. Singla, Additional Advocate General Punjab and
Ms. Kavita Joshi, Advocate, for the respondent/State.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (BNSS) seeking grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR no.11 dated 16.08.2022 registered under Sections 420, 409, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, and Sections 7, 7-A, 8, 12, 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, as amended vide P.C. (Amendment) Act, 2018, at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned Senior counsel contended that the FIR was lodged on 16.08.2022, and after investigation final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C was presented in Court on 14.11.2022, wherein the petitioner was only shown as a witness. The FIR *qua* four of the co-accused has already been quashed by this Court vide a common judgment dated 20.12.2024, passed in CRM-M-43528-2023, CRM-M-52719-2023 and CRM-M-34685-2024. The State has filed an SLP against it wherein notice to the respondents has also been issued, but no



interim relief has been granted. In the meanwhile, on the statement of one Rajdeep Nagra, recorded before the Enforcement Directorate (ED) on 11.09.2024, the State decided to nominate the petitioner as an accused vide DDR no.12 dated 19.04.2025, Annexure P-5. This is contrary to law, as the statement made by him in custody is not admissible in evidence, besides ED itself has not nominated the petitioner as an accused. He also contends that after filing of the challan/final report on 14.11.2022, further investigation could not have been carried out without seeking permission from the trial Court.

3. Learned State counsel on the contrary contends that investigation in the case is going on. He referred to a short order, dated 17.03.2025, passed by the trial Court wherein the case had been adjourned awaiting conclusion of investigation and submission of final report. Relevant portion of the order reads as under:

Case is adjourned to 03.05.2025 for awaiting the same, otherwise for concluding the investigation and submission of Report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. by the Police of Vigilance Bureau, Range, Ludhiana. A Report regarding the Status of Investigation be also called for the said date.

He has also referred to the statement of Rajdeep Nagra which indicates that cash payments were made to the petitioner on specific dates for securing particular tender(s), as the petitioner was Chairman of the Tender Committee. Besides, there are recorded Whatsapp messages between Rajdeep Nagra and the petitioner indicating the payments made and the favours given. All this needs to be investigated and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

4. Considering the totality of facts and circumstances, as also the nature of allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to



the petitioner as his custodial interrogation is required to establish the facts in the light of material that has come to the notice of the Investigating Agency. Besides, as apparent from the short order, dated 17.03.2025, it cannot be said that investigation in the case is over.

5. Dismissed.

September 15, 2025

ps

**(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/ reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*