



CRM-M-35861-2025

1

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

216

CRM-M-35861-2025
Decided on: 30.09.2025

GURTEJPAL SINGH @ TEJI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. H.S. Sugait, Advocate, and
Mr. Paramveer Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurtejpal Singh @ Teji, aged about 45 years	20	24.03.2025	316(2), 318(4) and (Section 304(2) of BNS added later on)	Mulepur	Fatehgarh Sahib

2. On 10.07.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-



<i>Name & age of Petitioner (s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Gurtejpal Singh @ Teji, aged about 45 years</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>24.03.2025</i>	<i>316(2), 318(4) and (Section 304(2) of BNS added later on)</i>	<i>Mulepur</i>	<i>Fatehgarh Sahib</i>

2. *The precise question raised before this Court in the present petition is whether the mere use of a car, allegedly owned by the petitioner and used by the accused persons named in the FIR, is sufficient to implicate the petitioner, especially when it is an admitted fact that he was not present at the time of the alleged incident.*

3. *The moot question, therefore, is that whether the petitioner had any role in conspiring with the main accused persons or possessed any prior knowledge of the incident involving snatching, in which his vehicle is said to have been used. Furthermore, there is nothing to be recovered from the petitioner, as the car in question, allegedly belonging to him, has already been recovered. Moreover, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the authorities, provided that he is granted protection from arrest by this Court.*

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 30.09.2025.*

7. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

8. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*



It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 10.07.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 26.09.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

5. Mr. Harvinder Singh, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his *vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record.

6. By referring to paragraph No.6 of the status report, learned State counsel, as well as counsel for the complainant, have attempted to establish that petitioner was also involved in the incident and was present at the spot at the time of its occurrence. For the said purpose, prosecution has now registered one DDR No. 10 dated 17.05.2025, which is based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Gurwinder Singh. As per the said disclosure statement, petitioner was present at the scene when the offence was committed.

Further, reference has been made to paragraph No.12 of the status report, wherein it is stated that, as per the confessional/disclosure statement of the petitioner himself, he received an amount of Rs.2,40,000/- from co-accused Gurwinder Singh, out of the total snatched amount of Rs.17,50,000/-. In light of these submissions, learned State counsel and counsel for the complainant argue that petitioner played an active role in the commission of the offence and, therefore, his petition for anticipatory bail deserves to be dismissed.

However, learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 08.08.2025 by the petitioner.



7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the status report submitted by learned State counsel.

8. Upon a conjoint reading of paragraph Nos.6 and 12 of the status report, this Court finds that the stand taken by the prosecution appears to be *prima facie* contradictory. On the one hand, it is alleged in paragraph No.6 that petitioner was present at the spot and actively involved in the incident. On the other hand, a disclosure statement of co-accused Gurwinder Singh was recorded after a delay of nearly two months, wherein it is stated that an amount of Rs.2,40,000/- was given to the petitioner, out of the total snatched amount.

Considering that petitioner has already joined the investigation in terms of the order dated 10.07.2025, this Court does not want to disturb the same. Accordingly, ad-interim bail order dated 10.07.2025, passed by this Court, is made absolute. Resultantly, present petition stands **allowed**.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

9. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

30.09.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO