



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

202-2

CRM-M-12456-2025

Date of decision: 22.07.2025

Guranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Jagdeep Singh Chahal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.01 dated 03.01.2025 under Sections 7, 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Phase-1, Punjab at Mohali, District SAS Nagar.

2. On 27.03.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned State counsel, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Upon being put to notice on the last date of hearing, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner was involved in collecting money from various transporters under the instructions of co-accused Ankit Kumar. Allegedly the petitioner had threatened the complainant and, while demanding a bribe of Rs.15,000/- on behalf of co-accused Ankit Kumar (ATO), warned that the vehicle of the complainant would be impounded if the demand was not met.

When a specific query was put to the learned State counsel as to whether any audio recordings existed



regarding the alleged demand of a bribe from the complainant similar to the recordings available concerning another co-accused who had allegedly demanded a bribe on behalf of co-accused Ankit Kumar, the State submitted that no such recordings were available in the case of the petitioner. However, it was contended by the learned State counsel that there was a financial transaction which had taken place involving Nitin Goyal, private agent, providing online services for filing road tax and other related matters. As per his statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, Nitin Goyal stated that the petitioner had approached him, expressing a need for Rs.15,000/- in cash and that on his request the said amount was then transferred into the bank account of Nitin Goyal via Google Pay, and this was the bribe amount. On a further query, as to whether the petitioner is involved in any other criminal case, learned counsel for the State has replied in the negative.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 27.03.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. 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.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 27.03.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

22.07.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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