



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-24077-2025
Date of decision: 10.09.2025

VIR BHANPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vir Bhan, aged about 53 years	48	12.02.2025	406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC	Tripri	Patiala

2. Short reply dated 03.07.2025 by way of an affidavit of Manoj Gors, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-II, District Patiala, has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record.

3. Reiterating his submissions recorded in the order dated 05.05.2025, counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was neither beneficiary of any



- 2-

amount nor same has been credited in his bank account. He has already explained his position that upto now in his carrier, while working on the post of Lambardar, he was never found wrongly identifying the person and thus, present case being first time in his carrier, seems to be a *bona fide* mistake but not an intentional attempt to defraud the purchaser.

Counsel further argues that it has been disclosed by the petitioner that he identified the wrong seller, on asking of DSP, Rahul Kaushal, instead of making him a co-accused petitioner has been pressurized to accept the crime.

He also argues that till date the person who was allegedly identified by the petitioner is neither been traced out, nor nominated with his actual identity anywhere during the course of investigation, and it all shows the poor standard of investigation conducted by the Police to trace out the real culprits.

However, he submits that the allegations would most likely be proved by the prosecution, only with the aid of documentary evidence. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner won't serve any meaningful purpose.

4. In view of the submissions having been recorded in the order dated 05.05.2025 and here today, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within a period of 02 weeks or as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

5. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would



submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10.09.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No