

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

CRM-M-8719-2026
Decided on: 07.05.2026

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent



CRM-M-8719-2026

fleeing from the spot, whereas Shahra Singh father of Surinder Singh, was apprehended.

(iii). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case has been falsely planted against the accused persons. It is argued that once a prior secret information had been received, in the normal course of events, it would be expected that the police would have conducted the raid with adequate manpower, and in that situation, it would have been improbable for the other accused, who had no prior knowledge of the raid, to flee from the spot. Moreover, FIR is silent as to any effort made by the police party to chase or apprehend the alleged fleeing accused. No steps whatsoever appear to have been taken to nab them. Thus, version set up by the prosecution is inherently improbable. It is further submitted that the alleged recovery of lahan has already been effected and Shahra Singh, owner of the house and father of the petitioner, has already been arrested. In these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation.

(iv). Additionally, learned counsel submits that petitioner – Mangal Singh has no connection with the place from where 600 litres of lahan has been recovered. Besides, one of the co-accused, namely; Surinder Singh, has already been granted concession of ad-interim bail vide order dated 05.02.2026, passed in CRM-M-6816-2026, titled as, “Surinder Singh v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P- and said petition is now posted for its hearing on 07.05.2026.

Thus, in view of above, he prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

(v). Notice of motion.

(vi). On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report by verifying the submissions addressed by the petitioner’s counsel.

(vii). Adjourned to 07.05.2026.

(viii). In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

(ix). Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial,

**CRM-M-8719-2026**

petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

(x). To be heard along with CRM-M-6816-2026.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the directions issued by this Court vide order dated 13.02.2026, the petitioner has joined investigation.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 13.02.2026 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 would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

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

07.05.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO