



CRM-M-39209-2025
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
215

CRM-M-39209-2025
Decided on : 15.09.2025

GURMEET SINGH . . . PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB . . . RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, 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 here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurmeet	82	30.06.2024	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 494 IPC	Makhu	Ferozepur

2. On 24.07.2025, following order was passed:-



CRM-M-39209-2025

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of 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 the First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurmeet	82	30.06.2024	420,465,467,468,471,120-B and 494 IPC	Makhu	Ferozepur

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the primary dispute between the complainant Kuldeep Singh and c-accused Manjit Kaur, is essentially matrimonial in nature. It is argued that the offence under Section 494 of IPC (now Section 82 of BNS, 2023), being non-cognizable, does not independently warrant criminal prosecution, and that the remaining offences have been added by allegedly concocting a false narrative of cheating and fraud solely to harass the petitioner.

3. Regarding the second allegation that for preparation of passport for Manjit Kaur, the petitioner mis-apprehended himself in place of complainant Kuldeep Singh and by doing so, the petitioner has not drawn any benefit as the actual beneficiary of the passport. If the same is ever used, that would be by the co-accused Manjit Kaur only. Further submits that even if allegations are taken to be containing some substance, the same requires to be proved through documentary evidence, and for that, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not serve any meaningful purpose.

Besides, petitioner is ready to join investigation, if protected from arrest. Thus, he prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent State, and seeks some time to respond to the

**CRM-M-39209-2025**

submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report by verifying the submissions addressed by the petitioner's counsel.

6. *Adjourned to 15.09.2025.*
7. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation 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.).*
8. *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.*
9. *It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.*
10. *To be heard along with CRM-M-37489-2025”.*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 24.07.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by learned counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 28.08.2025, by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of

2025:PHHC:128242



CRM-M-39209-2025

investigation. Reply has been filed by learned State counsel, is taken on record.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 24.07.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. **Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.**

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

September 15, 2025
Poonam Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No