



101+210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3893-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.03.2025

Sukhwinder Singh ...Petitioner
vs.
State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. G.S.Dhot, Advocate and
Mr. Gurvinder Singh Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naveen, Advocate for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

CRM-12420-2025

1. The applicant-petitioner has filed the present application under Section 428 of BNSS for placing on record affidavit of the petitioner.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Affidavit of the petitioner is taken on record.

CRM-M-3893-2025

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail in case FIR No.229 dated 31.08.2023 registered under Sections 408, 420, 465, 468, 471, 419, 467, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.
2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail on 24.01.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the FIR have been primarily levelled against Daya Singh, co-accused and the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by Daya Singh, co-accused. He further contends that the petitioner had no connection with various transactions, which had taken place between Daya Singh and the complainant. He further contends that the investigation in the present case was conducted by DSP, Patran, Patiala and the petitioner was found to be innocent in the present case. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner had never misused any cheque issued by the firm of the complainant nor any amount has been transferred in the account of the petitioner from the firm of the complainant. In fact, the petitioner was having a dispute with Daya Singh and he has been falsely involved in the present case. Moreover, the case hinges on the documentary evidence and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the above submissions. Apart from that, learned counsel for the petitioner has also filed an affidavit before this Court and submitted that the petitioner is not having any other cheque of the firm of the complainant and has never used any such cheque.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Patran, District Patiala and the same is taken on record. He submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that

serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In the present case, apparently, the case is based on documentary evidence and all the documents have already been taken into possession by the police. Moreover, the petitioner has also sworn an affidavit to the effect that he has not having any other cheque of the firm of the complainant and has never used any such cheque.

8. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the interim order dated 24.01.2025 is made absolute. He shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

25.03.2025

hemlata

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No