



CRM-M-45812-2025 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

S.No.104

CRM-M-45812-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 21.8.2025

Hardeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

By way of this petition, the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.212 dated 25.7.2025 registered under Sections 381, 408 IPC at Police Station Amargarh, District Malerkotla.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Gurbachan Singh with the allegations that he owns a petrol pump at village Chaundha where Hardeep Singh has been employed as a Manager. He himself visits the petrol pump occasionally and the entire business is managed by Hardeep Singh. He has also employed his aunt's son Gurpreet Singh as a salesman-cum-watchman at the petrol pump. When he



CRM-M-45812-2025 (O&M)

checked the accounts, some difference was found in the accounts and it has been found that Hardeep has misappropriated a sum of ₹ 13,34,066/-. Total profit should have been ₹ 21,48,390/- and after deducting the electricity expenses and other expenses of ₹ 8,14,324/-, savings were required to be ₹ 13,34,066/- and he sought action against him.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned State counsel and have gone through the material collected by the police during investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. The complainant had earlier moved one complaint on 23.7.2024 against him and the complainant and police visited his house and they had forcibly taken away his Alto car on 3.8.2024. He was also illegally detained and some documents/blank papers were got signed from him. He had made a complaint to SSP, Malerkotla but no action was taken. Thereafter, the complainant had withdrawn his complaint on 23.7.2024 against him. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner also submitted representation to SSP, Malerkotla and had also filed petition before Hon'ble High Court and High Court had directed SSP, Malerkotla to decide his representation and thereafter, the complainant had prepared a fabricated compromise alleged to have been executed by the petitioner in favour of the complainant whereby he gave his Alto car and cheque of ₹ 1,50,000/- and one plot measuring 5 Biswa to him against misappropriation of ₹ 5 lakh from the petrol pump. Infact, he is the victim at the hands of the complainant and the police and there is delay of more than 6 months in



CRM-M-45812-2025 (O&M)

lodging the FIR and tutored facts have been put forward. The petitioner is ready to join investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence as he has misappropriated huge amount despite being the custodian of the stock of petrol and diesel at the petrol pump and the custodial interrogation is essential for further investigation of the case and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. As per the version of the complainant, 71 tankers of oil which included 6,33,000 litres of diesel and 2,35,000 litres of petrol were purchased at the petrol pump whose commission comes to ₹ 21,48,390/- and after deducting the expenses, net profit was required to be ₹ 13,34,066/- but the petitioner misappropriated the diesel and petrol worth ₹ 15,14,678/- and his custodial interrogation is thus essential to ascertain the manner in which the amount has been misappropriated. The record in his possession and the amount embezzled by him too have to be recovered for which custodial interrogation is essential. In case, the petitioner is interrogated under protective umbrella of the order of ad-interim anticipatory bail of this Court, he is not likely to answer the questions in right earnest.

7. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and the petition in hand is dismissed.



CRM-M-45812-2025 (O&M)

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

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

August 21, 2025

Paritosh Kumar

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