



CRM-M-49758-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-49758-2025
Decided on: 27.11.2025

Inder Kumar Bedi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. R.G.S. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Vinay Malhotra, 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 FIR No.140 dated 20.06.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of BNS, at PS City Rajpura, District Patiala.

2. On 08.09.2025, following order was passed:

“Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.140 dated 20.06.2025 under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of BNS, registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is an old aged man of 82 years, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. The matter is purely of civil nature and civil litigation is already pending between the parties and matter is subjudice before the Civil Court. The case is based on the documentary evidence and submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and he is ready and willing to join the investigation.



Notice of motion.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file status report.

List on 27.11.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/ Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS. ”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance to the order dated 08.09.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation on 18.09.2025. Otherwise, dispute is of civil nature. Additionally, it is informed that the petitioner is handicapped as he cannot look after himself in day to day functioning as, he is making his movements only while sitting in the wheelchair.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report in the Court today, which is taken on record. On instructions from SI Malvinder Singh, he confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 18.09.2025 by the petitioner, and submits that though the investigation has been joined by the petitioner, however, despite his undertaking before the Lok Adalat, he neither restored possession of the said land nor complied with his commitment.

5. I have considered the submissions and gone through the petition as well as the status report. It is not a disputed position that, the petitioner is aged 82 years and is making movements while sitting in the wheel chair. It is also not seriously disputed that the petitioner has already joined investigation. No specific

**CRM-M-49758-2025**

reason has been assigned by the learned State counsel to say that for what specific purpose, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, whatever has been stated in the status report is not worth convincing to decline the prayer, which infact has already been entertained and granted.

6. In view of the aforementioned submissions and observations made by this Court, ad-interim bail order dated 08.09.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

7. The 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.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he/she would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.11.2025

reena

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO