



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

206

CRM-M-21224-2025

Date of decision: 6th August, 2025

Ashok Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. M.D. Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 80 dated 30.03.2025 registered under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC at Police Station Derabassi, District SAS Nagar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the complaint lodged by the complainant Gurnam Singh alleging that he had been induced by the petitioner to part with a sum of Rs. 7,00,000/- on the pretext that the petitioner would secure a government job in the State Bank of India in favour of the son of the complainant. After receiving the money, the petitioner had represented that appointment letter would be issued after completion of process within two weeks. He kept on alluring the petitioner. He had subsequently represented that an appointment letter had been issued in favour of the son of the complainant and he was to undergo training. He had given a false and fabricated appointment letter and this fact came to the



notice of son of the complainant when he went to the place of training. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail which has been dismissed by the court of learned Additional sessions Judge, SAS Nagar vide order dated 15.04.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the petitioner used to sell clothing and had been visiting the village of the complainant from the last 30 years. On asking of the complainant to find a suitable job for his son, he had simply introduced him with Asha Makkar, who used to arrange jobs. He had given her mobile number. Nothing else had been done by the petitioner and the complainant had been talking with the said Asha Makkar. He never received any money from the complainant. He is not beneficiary of the transaction which had taken place between the co-accused and the complainant. There is delay of more than five years in lodging of the FIR. According to the complainant himself, the occurrence had taken place in the year 2020. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. It is relevant to mention here that vide order dated 12.05.2025, the petitioner was directed to join the investigation and as per the instructions received from HC Mukesh Kumar, learned State counsel has informed that he has joined the investigation on 24.05.2025 and his custodial interrogation is not required. Given the nature of the allegations and the circumstances peculiar to this case and coupled with the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation



is not required, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the order dated 12.05.2025 is made absolute, subject to the petitioner's appearing before the Investigating/Arresting officer and joining investigation as and when required and subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to his satisfaction within a period of ten days from today. Apart from this, the petitioner shall be abide by the following terms and conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the investigating officer/arresting officer as and when required.

(ii) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

(iii) he shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

5. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

6th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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