



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

Sr.No.206

**CRM-M-6847-2026
Decided on : 18.04.2026**

Gurpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.183 dated 24.09.2025, registered under Sections 304(2), 324(4), 333 and 317(2) (added lateron) at Police Station Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural.
2. Brief facts, as per the prosecution case, are that the petitioner alongwith co-accused armed with *datar* forcibly entered the office of complainant; attempted to extort money by giving threats and snatched an amount of Rs.1,38,000/- from one Manjeet Singh. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and that he has no concern with the alleged offence. It is also submitted that



the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon by the investigating agency. Therefore, it is urged that the instant petition deserves to be allowed.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 21.01.2026.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel, while referring to the status report already on record, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. It is submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution, the petitioner alongwith co-accused armed with datar, trespassed into the factory premises of the complainant and forcibly snatched an amount of Rs.1,38,000/-. It is further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple other criminal cases meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the material available on record, this Court is of the view that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. As per prosecution version, the petitioner armed with deadly weapons forcibly entered the factory premises of the complainant and snatched an amount of Rs.1,38,000/-. The manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, coupled with the specific role attributed to the petitioner, does not entitle him to the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail. The involvement of the petitioner in other criminal cases also cannot be ignored at this stage. As per prosecution, the recovery is yet to be effected. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for



anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine and seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

7. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is 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 accused in all criminal



cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as **"P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement"**, (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".

Economic Offences

78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

XXX XXX XXX

83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and



also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

10. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

18.04.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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