



- 1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-49084-2025
Date of decision: 17.09.2025

HARPREET SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Kanwaljit S. Brar, Advocate and
Mr. Sanjeev Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.346 dated 01.08.2025, under Sections 331(4) and 306 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.
2. Status report dated 16.09.2025 by way of affidavit of Satvir Singh PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Barnala has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record.
3. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 01.08.2025, a ruqa was received from SI Manpreet Singh with the allegations that he had conducted checking of Malkhana of PS City Barnala through ASI Ranjit Singh and found that the case property i.e. cash amount of Rs. 35,68,300/- of case FIR no. 344/2020, Rs. 17,850/- of case FIR no. 344/2020, Rs. 95,000/- of case FIR no. 238/2020, Rs. 1,20,000/- of case FIR no. 90/2021, Rs. 1,03,000/- of case FIR no. 275/2022 along-with one Gold Kara weighing about 146.350 gram, Rs. 2,73,000/- of case FIR no. 111/2023, Rs. 10,000/- of case FIR no. 393/2024, Rs 2,22,400/- of



- 2-

case FIR no. 404/2023, Rs. 1,18,000/- of case FIR no. 428/2022, Rs. 4,25,000/- of case FIR no. 527/2023, Rs. 1,83,000/- of case FIR no. 270/2022, Rs. 2,05,000/- of case FIR no. 228/2023 and Rs. 2,07,500/- of case FIR no. 361/2022 i.e. total amount of Rs. 55,48,050/-. On enquiry, it was found that a theft has been committed by Constable Harpreet Singh (present petitioner), who was deployed as Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & System Operator in Police Station City Barnala, during the intervening night of 04/05.06.2025 with the help of duplicate keys by opening the lock of Malkhana in a wrongful manner. Apprehending his arrest, petitioner applied for anticipatory bail, which was rejected by the Court of Sessions Judge, Barnala, vide order dated 27.08.2025.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He along with his wife is serving in the same department for the last 15 years. The FIR has been lodged on 01.08.2025, whereas as per the allegations, the theft had taken place on the intervening night of 04/05.06.2025. As per Punjab Police Rules 1934, the Malkhana is checked by the concerned Officer twice every month and no such shortcoming was ever found from June, till the FIR was registered and he has been made a scapegoat. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has argued that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Petitioner had opened the Malkhana with the duplicate keys and this fact has been captured in the CCTV footage and



thereafter, he has taken away valuable property from the Malkhana on various occasions. Learned counsel further contended that the investigation is at initial stage and grant of anticipatory bail will hamper the investigation and in view of the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Petitioner was posted as Crime and Criminal Tracking Network & System Operator in Police Station City Barnala and during the night, he opened the Malkhana with duplicate keys and has taken away cash amounting to Rs.55,48,050/- as well as some gold ornaments, which were case properties of different FIRs registered in the Police Station. CCTV footage of the incident is also available, wherein petitioner is seen carrying stolen property from the Malkhana on various occasions. Merely because Malkhana was not inspected twice a month and there was some dereliction in discharge of duty by the Incharge of the Police Station, the same cannot be of any help to the petitioner and he cannot be absolved on this account for the offence committed by him. The investigation is at initial stage. Huge amount of cash and gold jewellery have been siphoned off by the petitioner from the Malkhana, who himself was the custodian of the same and as such, his custodial interrogation is essential for proper investigation and for recovery of money and jewellery. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail and accordingly bail application is hereby dismissed.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

17.09.2025
amandeep

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