



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-44889-2024

MANPREET KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CRM-M-46275-2024

PARAMJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

Date of decision: April 08, 2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sanjeev K. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petitions have been filed by the petitioners under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.62 dated 08.08.2024 under Sections 318(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Chamkaur Sahib, District Rupnagar.
2. After issuing notice of motion on 10.09.2024, the petitioners had been granted interim bail by this Court vide order dated 06.11.2024, with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the order dated 06.11.2024 reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly inducing the complainant to deliver Rs.2,00,000/- to forbear themselves from playing news against the complainant



and further taking Rs.20,000/- from the complainant, supposedly on behalf of DSP Chamkaur Sahib.

While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR annexed as Annexure P-1, learned counsel submits that a bare perusal of the same reveals that the essential elements to attract the mischief of the alleged offences are clearly amiss in the case in hand as there is no material produced by the complainant that the petitioners ever demanded, much less received any illegal payment, or sought any benefit on behalf of any officer. It is further submitted that the petitioners as press reporters, had published news reports on complaints made against the complainant, who is a travel agent, as several people had alleged that the complainant took money with promises of sending them abroad but failed to fulfill those promises. In support, learned counsel has placed reliance on Annexures P-2 and P-3. Learned counsel submits that therefore, the instant case is just a pressure tactic by the complainant to pressure the petitioners into not reporting against him and instead coerce them into publishing favourable news.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners reiterates that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present cases. He submits that in compliance of order dated 06.11.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioners are not required for further investigation, much less for their custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petitions are allowed, and interim order dated 06.11.2024 is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

7. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected matter.

April 08, 2025

Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*