



CRM-M-59199-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-59199-2025 (O&M)

Decided on: 04.12.2025

Manjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Budhiraja, Advocate and
Ms. Reena, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Jatinder Kumar Kansal, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.CRM-43247-2025

Prayer in the present application is for impleading the complainant as respondent No.2 in the present petition and for placing on record the amended memo of parties.

Notice in the application.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State and pleads no objection, if the present application is allowed.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and for the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Complainant, namely, Puspa w/o of Vinod Kumar is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition.

The amended memo of parties is taken on record.

Main case

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.174 dated 26.09.2025, registered under



Sections 318(4), 336(3), 339/340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Pushpa w/o Vinod Kumar. It was alleged that the complainant and her family do the work of collecting scrap material from the villages and thereafter, sell it to Manjit Singh (petitioner) and Bittu Singh and on account of the same, they had good acquaintance with them. The complainant purchased a lottery ticket at Rampura Phul and won a prize of 2.5 crores on 21.07.2025. It was further alleged that when the agents came to her house then she informed about the same to Manjit Singh and Bittu Singh as she had good acquaintance with them. However, Manjit Singh and Bittu Singh took the lottery ticket from her well as the entire prize money and had only given back Rs.38 lacs to her. On demanding the remaining money, they abused her and threatened to eliminate her. It was alleged that due to the threatening by the accused persons, husband of the complainant suffered heart attack and he is under treatment. On the complaint being filed by the complainant, the matter was enquired into by the police. From the record of the Directorate of Punjab State Lottery, it was found that the complainant purchased two lottery tickets from Om Parkash in the name of Bhagwan Bhole Shankar and Om Shankar on which name of Vikas Mehta i.e. son of the complainant was mentioned. Vikas Mehta received telephonic message that the lottery ticket bearing B890826 is successful and the complainant was called to receive the prize money from the State office. However, Vinod Kumar husband of the complainant, suffered heart attack on hearing the said news. The doctor



CRM-M-59199-2025

-3-

demanded Rs.5 to 6 lacs for the treatment. As Vinod Kumar had financial transaction with Manjeet Singh (petitioner), Vikas Mehta went to the petitioner and requested for money for the treatment of his father. However, the petitioner snatched the lottery ticket from him and handed over Rs.2 lacs for the treatment of his father and claimed share in the lottery prize money failing which he threatened to tear the lottery ticket. Faced with the threat, the complainant's son agreed to give share in the prize money to Manjeet Singh and Naveen Kumar. The petitioner obtained the signatures of Vikas Mehta, Vicky Mehta and Naveen Kumar on stamp paper. The petitioner, in connivance with co-accused Romal and after forging documents, got the lottery prize money encashed. Out of the total amount, a sum of Rs.32 lakh was handed over by the petitioner to Naveen Kumar, and Rs.38 lakh was given to the petitioner's sons. Naveen Kumar subsequently transferred the Rs.32 lakh to the petitioner's sons. The petitioner got deposited the prize money into his own bank account. An amount of Rs.4,90,000 was paid to accused Umesh Garg, while Rs.19,60,000 was received by one Dhruv. The petitioner misappropriated the amount, and the complainant was paid only Rs.70 lakh out of the total prize money of Rs1.75 crore. Hence, the present FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for grant of anticipatory bail, however, after hearing both the side, learned Court declined the same, vide order dated 13.10.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of anticipatory bail.

This Court vide order dated 17.10.2025 had granted interim



CRM-M-59199-2025

-4-

protection to the petitioner by directing the Investigating Agency not to take any coercive action against him.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is running a tile factory in the name of M/s Guru Nanak Tile Industries as well as he is working as a scrap/junk material dealer in the said name and he is regularly paying GST. He has submitted that the petitioner gave Rs.2 lacs to the son of the complainant for treatment of his father and thereafter, he handed over the lottery ticket to the petitioner. He submits that as per the settlement arrived at between the parties, Vikas Mehta, i.e. son of the complainant, received their entire share of the money and thereafter, handed over the lottery ticket to the petitioner, along with all rights attached thereto, which were subsequently reduced into writing by the petitioner. However, the complainant became greedy and made a complaint to SSP Bathinda levelling the allegation of fraud and thereafter, present FIR was registered after a delay of three months. He has further submitted that as per the enquiry, total money received by the complainant is Rs.72 lacs, whereas, prize money of lottery after deduction is 1,02,50,000/-. He submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case in a due deliberated manner and thus, in the facts and circumstances, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of Manoj Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Rampura Phul, District Bathinda has already been taken on record. She has submitted that there are serious



CRM-M-59199-2025

-5-

allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR as he has played a vital role in the entire incident and duped the money of the complainant. She has submitted that from the agreement prepared by the petitioner, it is apparent that the lottery ticket was purchased by the complainant, namely, Pushpa, which has been confessed by co-accused Umesh Kumar before the police. She, thus, submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as the amount in dispute is yet to be recovered from him and hence, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record from their able assistance. It is deciphered that the lottery ticket was purchased by the complainant, namely, Pushpa. The complainant though had acquaintance with the petitioner, however, the same is intentionally exploited as husband of the complainant suffered cardiac arrest. Compromise arrived at between the complainant and the petitioner side is meaningless. The same has been arrived only to defraud the helpless complainant. The Court cannot ignore the fact that the complainant became successful in winning the lottery with some extra ordinary blessings and luck and no one has any right over the lottery won by the complainant. Conduct of the petitioner is highly shady. Plight of the complainant has been exploited by the petitioner in conspiracy with other co-accused.

6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

482“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

- 1. When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may*



apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.

2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
 - (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
 - (iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."*

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State represented by CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

"6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconded with a favorable order under [Section 438](#) if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disintering many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all



CRM-M-59199-2025

-7-

accused in all criminal cases. The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in task of disintering offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8. Hon’ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab**, AIR 1980 SC 1632, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary circumstances.

9. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

10. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in his favour. Resultantly, the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

11. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.12.2025
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No