



CRM-M-35612-2026

1

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

CRM-M-35612-2026
Date of decision: 06.07.2026

CHANDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER**...PETITIONERS****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Mr. A.P.Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioners.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Section 438 of Cr.P.C) seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner in GD No. 17 dated 19.05.2026 vide which offence under Sections 467/468/471 of IPC (corresponding Sections 338, 336, 339 of BNS has been added) in FIR No. 183 dated 01.08.2025 registered under Sections 406/420/120-B of IPC (corresponding Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 61 of BNS) registered at Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners had been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 29.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-51604-2025 and CRM-M-59230-2025. He further submits that, thereafter, at the instance of the complainant, who allegedly exercised political influence over the police, offences under Sections 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC were added vide GD No. 17 dated 19.05.2026 without any justification and without affording the petitioner an



opportunity of hearing. Learned counsel further submits that the police, at the behest of the complainant, are now conducting raids at the petitioner's residence on the ground that, although the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail in respect of the offences originally mentioned in the FIR, no pre-arrest bail has been granted in respect of the offences subsequently added. Accordingly, he prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in respect of the subsequently added offences.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. P.S. Pandher, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners.
5. I have heard the submissions made by ld. counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that, although offences under Sections 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC have subsequently been added, no new or additional factual allegations have been incorporated, this Court finds no reason to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and to abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

06.07.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:Yes/No

Whether reportable:Yes/No