



213

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

CRM-M-51601-2025**Date of Decision: 29.09.2025****RAMJEET SINGH**

..... Petitioner

*Versus***STATE OF PUNJAB**

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.56, dated 29.06.2024, registered at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural (Annexure P-1), under Sections 419, 420, 406 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 and Section 66(D) of Information Technology Act, 2000.

2. In compliance of order dated 15.09.2025 passed by this Court, status report by way of affidavit dated 28.09.2025 of Varinder Singh Khosa, PPS, DSP, Dakha, District Ludhiana (Rural) filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.



3. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Balwant Singh son of Lal Singh with the allegations that he is a permanent resident of Canada since the year 2017 and had earlier retired as Junior Engineer from PSPCL. His pension was being deposited in his bank account in State Bank of India, SBI Branch, Sudhar. When he came to India, he found that only a sum of Rs.20,912/- is lying as balance in this account whereas he has never withdrawn any amount and the total amount in his account should have been around Rs.46 lakh. He never started online transactions and no ATM card was got issued and he made a prayer for taking action against the culprits. During investigation, it has been found that the amounts have been transferred from the bank account of complainant in the bank account of Saroop Singh (already arrested) and petitioner Ramjeet Singh and the statement of account was obtained from the concerned bank which showed that a sum of Rs.6,54,502/- was transferred in the bank account of petitioner-Ramjeet Singh and two payments of Rs.16,31,005/- & Rs.1,84,008/- were transferred in the account of Saroop Singh and Rs.22,40,000/- was withdrawn in cash by Saroop Singh. Apprehending arrest, petitioner applied for the bail before the Court of Sessions, Judge which was rejected.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Infact, it is Saroop Singh who is the main culprit. Said Saroop Singh had borrowed a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- from him against pronote and in order to re-pay the amount, he had transferred the amount of Rs.6,54,502/- from the account of complainant in his account and he has no concern with the present case. 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.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that it is the petitioner who is the main culprit and he had merely paid around Rs.12 lakh to the co-accused Saroop Singh for performing the marriage of his daughter and remaining amount has been usurped by him. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is, thus, essential to find out the modus operandi and the manner in which the account was hacked and amounts have been withdrawn and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. It is well settled that the power to grant anticipatory bail is of extra-ordinary nature and is to be sparingly used with circumspection. This court is fortified by the observations made in case of 2022 (4) RCR (Criminal) 968 titled as "***Sachin @ Sachin Ahuja Vs. State of Punjab***". In case of SLP (Crl.) 7940 2023 titled as "***Shri Kant Upadhay Vs. State of Bihar***", Hon'ble Apex Court has held that grant of interim protection or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or destruction of evidence. The court is cognizant of the fact that power of anticipatory bail is to be exercised in exceptional circumstances as it may cause some hindrance to normal flow of investigation which would undermine the case of the prosecution.

7. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The version of petitioner that Saroop Singh had borrowed a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- from him and re-paid the same to him from the account of present complainant cannot be believed. In case, Saroop Singh had borrowed some amount, same should have been paid from his own account

and not from the bank account of the complainant. The victim has been duped of huge sum of rupees. He never had any online transaction facility or a ATM Card got issued. As to how, present fraud has been committed and amount withdrawn from his account requires thorough investigation. In case, petitioner is extended the benefit of anticipatory bail, it will hamper the investigation and his custodial interrogation is essential and petitioner, thus, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

8. The present petition stands dismissed.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

29.09.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No