



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

212/3

CRM-M-19112-2025

Date of decision: May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Arpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Pragyat Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in FIR No.17 dated 10.03.2025 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC and Section 7-A of The Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, District Patiala.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 07.04.2025, following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner were recorded:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner has inter alia argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case without any cogent or credible evidence. It is submitted that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused merely due to his relationship with co-accused, Kuldeep Singh. Sehgal and Harmeet Singh. The FIR (Annexure P-1), it is argued, contains bald allegations that the petitioner received Rs.20,000/- for facilitating the preparation of forged registration certificates of tractors, but such allegations are wholly unsubstantiated. It is contended that the petitioner, a*

*registered agent operating from Patiala, merely performed his duties of assisting in routine document transfers.*

*It is further urged that the petitioner is neither a signatory to any forged document nor is there any direct evidence linking him with the alleged offences.”*

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 24.04.2025, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 24.04.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 24.04.2025 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025  
*Puneet*

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No