

2025.PHHC:094435



105

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

**CRM-M-40465-2025
DECIDED ON: 29.07.2025**

TAJINDER KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Karan Kapoor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 59 dated 26.03.2025 under Sections 406, 420 of IPC registered at Police Station Model Town, Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur (Annexure P-1).

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that out of the total amount of Rs. 12.50 lakhs, a sum of Rs. 9 lakhs has already been returned by the petitioner to the complainant. It is further submitted that the petitioner has entered into a compromise with the complainant for repayment of the remaining amount.

Counsel further undertakes, on behalf of the petitioner, that the petitioner is ready and willing to amicably settle the matter in its entirety.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. TPS Walia, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. Though he could not controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, but prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner has duped the complainant on the pretext of sending his brother abroad.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact that the petitioner has already paid an amount of Rs.9 lacs to show his *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to settle the matter amicably added with the fact that the petitioner is a person of clean antecedents, as he is not involved in any other case, there is no reason for custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. 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, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

29.07.2025
Meenu

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