



**213-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-43656-2025
Date of decision: 16.09.2025**

MANAV BANSAL

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

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

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 (for short 'BNSS, 2023'), the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.154 dated 17.06.2025 registered under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS, 2023') at Police Station City-1, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case as there are different versions of the complainant in his civil suit and in his complaint before the police. He further contended that there is no explanation regarding the source of money allegedly taken away by the accused/petitioner i.e. receipt of withdrawal from the bank etc. As such, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.



3. Learned State counsel has filed short reply dated 25.08.2025 on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner. He submitted that the present petitioner along with co-accused played a fraud by impersonating as owner of the property and received an amount of Rs.40 lakhs from the complainant and the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

4. Mr. Mohd. Jameel, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his power of attorney. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place. Learned counsel for the complainant submitted that present petitioner along with his co-accused played a fraud with the complainant and cheated him to the tune of Rs.40 lakhs and also took away two cheques with him. Further, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Manpreet impersonated as one Gurpreet being the owner of the property, as property does not belong to him. Furthermore, Gurpreet was joined during investigation and made statement under Section 180 BNSS, 2023 (*erstwhile Section 161 Cr.P.C.*). As such, learned counsel for the respondent prayed for dismissal of anticipatory bail as the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation i.e. for recovery of the amount taken away by him and for recovery of the cheque.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the manner, in which the offence has been committed; the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for collection of evidence as well as recovery of alleged amount and cheques. Thus, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.



7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

September 16, 2025
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |