



CRM-M-58923-2025

1

208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58923-2025
Date of decision: 19.11.2025

JAGJEET SINGH

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Ms. Jigyasa Kharbanda, Advocate for
Mr. Sumeet Sagar Maini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parneet Singh Pandher, Assistant A.G.Punjab

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 218 dated 16.09.2025 under Section 420 of IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Faridkot District Faridkot.
2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner along with his co-accused accepted a sum of Rs. 45,00,000/- from the complainants on the pretext of getting them jobs in Punjab Police Department.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that no amount has been transferred into his account. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a mason by occupation, earning approximately Rs. 500–600 per day, and, being a labourer, he is not in a position to offer or secure the post of Sub-Inspector for the complainants.
4. Mr. P.K.S.Phoolka, Advocate appears and filed his Vakalatnama on

behalf of the complainants in the Court today and the same is taken on record.



CRM-M-58923-2025

2

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that allegations levelled against the petitioner are specific, direct, and supported by material evidence on record. It is further contended that the petitioner was actively and knowingly complicit with the co-accused in duping the complainants.
6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.
7. Having considered the nature and seriousness of the allegations, particularly the assertion that the petitioner received money and duped innocent individuals, thereby causing them to lose their hard-earned savings, this Court is of the view that no case for grant of bail is made out. In view of the gravity of the accusations, the specific and direct role attributed to the petitioner, and the material indicating his active involvement in cheating the complainants of a substantial amount, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Consequently, no ground is made out for grant of bail at this stage, and the present petition stands dismissed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

19.11.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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