



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101+215

CRM-M-30956-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.07.2025

Siddharth Singh @ Aditya Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

None for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CRM-24796-2025

Prayer in the instant application is for placing on record Annexures P.6 & P.7.

It is stated that it was wrongly asserted vide paragraph 15 of the petition that the petitioner is not an accused in any other FIR but in fact he is involved in two other criminal cases. Said averment made was not intentional but was due to communication gap between the petitioner and his counsel.

Notice in the application.

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab accepts notice of the application and has raised no objection to the prayer.

Filing of reply to the petition is waived of.

Allowed, as prayed for subject to all just exceptions and Annexures P.6 and P.7 are taken on record.

Main case

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.132 dated 10.05.2023 under Sections 406,420,120-B IPC and Sections 465,467,468,471 IPC (added later) on registered at P.S Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar.



2. Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that both the parties had mutually agreed to compromise the matter and in the event of petitioner furnishing an undertaking before the trial Court that he would return a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the complainant, concession of bail was granted to him. It is submitted that now out of the said amount, a sum of Rs.14,00,000/- has admittedly been paid by the petitioner and only a sum of Rs.50,000/- remains to be paid, which was agreed to be actually paid at the time of recording of statements before the trial court. Based on the compromise, a quashing petition was filed by the petitioner but the complainant did not come forward to fulfil her part of compromise to record her statements before the trial court therefore, he prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State counsel does not controvert the aforesaid facts but opposes the prayer.

3. Analysis

Be that as it may, considering the fact that a sum of Rs.14,00,000/- has admittedly been paid by the petitioner and only a sum of Rs.50,000/- remains to be paid, which was agreed to be actually paid at the time of passing of order therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

5. Relief

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation



of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

09.07.2025
manoj

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