



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

105-4

CRM-M-28652-2025

Date of decision: 22.05.2025

Rupinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.51 dated 23.04.2025 under Sections 318(4), 343, 61(2)(a) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda.

2. The allegations against the petitioner pertain to the tearing of an agreement to sell dated 01.12.2024, purportedly executed between the complainant and the accused persons, allegedly to resile from the contractual obligations pertaining to the sale of land.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute between the parties is essentially civil in nature, arising from an agreement concerning the sale of immovable property. It is contended that the FIR was registered after an inordinate and unexplained delay of over four months from the date of the alleged occurrence, which casts serious doubt on the veracity of the allegations. It is further argued that



CRM-M-28652-2025

no specific overt-act has been attributed to the petitioner and that he has fully cooperated with the investigation, after he was granted interim protection by the learned Trial Court, vide order dated 06.05.2025. It has been further contended that nothing remains to be recovered from the petitioner and, therefore, his custodial interrogation would not be required.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. He, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner is clearly identified in a video recording wherein he, along with the co-accused, is seen tearing the agreement to sell. It is further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary moreso when he has persistently failed to cooperate with the investigating agency even though he was extended the concession of interim bail by the learned Trial Court. It has been further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner becomes even more imperative as the petitioner is involved in two other criminal cases under the IPC which clearly reflects his proclivity to flout the law and indulge in illegal activities.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. The allegations against the petitioner are *prima facie* specific and serious in nature. The act of tearing a legally enforceable

**CRM-M-28652-2025**

document in concert with others, with the intent to defeat contractual obligations, not only suggests deliberate criminality but also undermines the sanctity of legal agreements. The involvement of the petitioner in similar illegal acts, as demonstrated by his antecedents—being involved in two other criminal cases—further compounds the concern of this Court with regards to the possibility of tampering with evidence.

9. In the light of the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the gravity of the offence and the role attributed to him, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.05.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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