



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

209

CRM-M-25304-2025

Date of decision: 10th July, 2025

Karan Goyal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. C.S. Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 97 dated 09.04.2025 registered under Sections 303(2) and 317(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. As per the allegations, on 09.04.2025, a police party headed by SI Pavitar Singh was patrolling in the area of Chhokra Gate, Phillaur when a secret information was received that accused Jaskaran Singh, Sukhvir Singh @ Sonu and Gurjinder Singh were roaming in the vicinity in a stolen Innova car and were looking for a chance to commit theft of another vehicle. It was also informed that the stolen Innova car was purchased by them from the



present petitioner and all of them were indulged in illegal trade of sale and purchase of stolen cars in-conivance with each other. As per the secret information, they could be apprehended, if a barricade was formed. Believing the secret information to be true, intimation was sent to police station for registration of FIR. A police party rushed towards the informed place and created a barricade. Sometime, thereafter, the aforementioned Innova vehicle was found coming. It was stopped. The accused Jaskaran Singh, Sukhbir Singh @ Sonu and Gurjinder Singh were occupants of the same. They were apprehended. They suffered disclosure statements to the effect that they had purchased the vehicle from the petitioner, who was a scrap dealer at a throw away price. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, which was dismissed vide order dated 30.04.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of some secret information and disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He is a scrap dealer. No recovery is to be effected from him. His custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready to join the investigation. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He has criminal antecedents as he is involved in a



similar case bearing FIR No. 24 dated 01.04.2025 registered at Police Station Goraya, Jalandhar. For proper investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is must. No extra ordinary or sparing circumstance has even otherwise been made out for the purpose of extending benefit of bail to the petitioner. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have retained a stolen Innova car with him and is further alleged to have sold the same to the co-accused. It was not only on the basis of a secret information, but also the disclosure statements of the co-accused that the petitioner was nominated as accused. For the purpose of conducting thorough and proper probe into the matter as to the source from where the stolen car had come into possession of the co-accused, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled proposition of law that the custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. Many useful information can be disinterred during custodial interrogation. Moreso, no exceptional or extra ordinary circumstance warranting exercise of powers for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out in this case. Keeping in view the nature of the subject offences and the role attributed to the petitioner and for the purpose of eliciting the truth, I am of the considered opinion that he does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. Accordingly, the petition



stands dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

10th July, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*