



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

206

CRM-M-11063-2025

Date of decision: 22nd April, 2025

Baljeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The instant one is the second petition for grant of pre-arrest bail as filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 177 dated 16.09.2022 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural. The previous petition bearing CRM-M-50851-2024 as filed by the petitioner, had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 18.10.2024.

2. The facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of order received from the Court of Smt. Tejinderpreet Kaur, Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Jagraon in case arising out of FIR No. 187 dated 10.07.2017 registered under Sections 379, 411, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC at Police Station Sidwan Bet, wherein the petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was admitted to bail. Surety bonds had been furnished by one Gurdeep Singh s/o Surjit Singh, resident of village Sosan. The evaluation report qua the property of



Gurdeep Singh shown to be signed by concerned Patwari and Tehsildar were produced along with the surety bonds. The surety bonds were accepted and the petitioner was released on bail in the above named case. Subsequently, it was revealed that no surety bonds had been furnished by original Gurdeep Singh and someone had impersonated him. It was also revealed that the valuation report of property details of which were furnished, was also forged one. The aforementioned FIR was registered against the petitioner. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, which was dismissed vide order dated 04.01.2023.

3. It is argued by larned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He had arranged surety but was not aware about the type of the documents submitted by the surety or about the genuineness of the same. He is ready to join the investigation and to abide by terms and conditions to be imposed upon him. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations and the fact that for conducting thorough investigation in the matter, custodial inerrogation of the petitioner is required, she has urged that petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have connived with the co-accused



and in pursuance of that conspiracy, is alleged to have produced the co-accused, who impersonated the actual Gurdeep Singh and stood as surety for the petitioner. Not even this, forged valuation report and signatures of the concerned Tehsildar and Patwari have also been alleged to be produced before the Court, which had passed order of release of the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 187. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. In my opinion, for the purpose of conducting thorough investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled that custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. Many useful information can be disinterred during custodial interrogation. Moreso, no exceptional or extra ordinary circumstance warranting exercise of powers for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out in this case. Keeping in view the nature of the subject offences and the role attributed to the petitioner and for the purpose of eliciting the truth, I am of the considered opinion that he does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

22nd April, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No