



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

216

CRM-M-31800-2025

*Date of decision: 09.07.2025***Gurdeep Singh***.....Petitioner**Versus***State of Punjab***.....Respondents***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Varinder Singh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Sirphikhi, Advocate for the complainant.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)****1. Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.12 dated 17.03.2025 under Sections 406,420,120-B IPC registered at P.S Handesra, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

**2. Contention****On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It was the complainant-Ajaib Singh, who fraudulently obtained the petitioner's thumb impressions on several blank papers and that no actual payment or consideration was ever received by the petitioner. The dispute is of civil nature and a civil suit in this respect is also pending consideration.

**On behalf of State**

On the other hand, learned State counsel prays for denial of the concession of bail by submitting that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the amount to the tune of Rs.3,15,09,000/- which can be effected only in the police investigation.

**3. Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering that present case revolves around documentary evidence and civil suit is pending before the court below against the complainant, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

**5. Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

*‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

*(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*

*(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*



*(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*

*(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**( SANDEEP MOUDGIL )  
JUDGE**

09.07.2025  
manoj

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