



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

227

CRM-M No.9292 of 2026

Date of decision : 24.3.2026

Date of uploading : 25.3.2026

Shri Kant Dham

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab

**Mr. Satwinder Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. Ajay Gupta, Advocate, for respondent no.2**

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 24.2.2026, the following order was passed:

'Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.29 dated 28.01.2026, registered for offences punishable under Sections 329(3), 305, 351(2), 62 and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023, at Police Station City-II, Khanna, District Ludhiana; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question on account of a property dispute, the FIR in question emanates from a civil dispute, the petitioner is son of the FIR-complainant, a civil suit between the rival parties is pending adjudication before the Court below, the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents, & the petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.

Put up on 24.03.2026.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 05.03.2026 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join



investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.'

2. Learned State counsel (on instructions) submits that pursuant to the order dated 24.2.2026, the petitioner has joined investigation but his custodial interrogation is required for recovering the money in question.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail of the petitioner by arguing that there are direct and serious allegations against the petitioner and in case he has extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may flee from the hands of justice and may influence the prosecution witnesses/evidence.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, especially keeping in view the factum that the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is sought only for recovery of money in question; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 24.2.2026.

5. In view of the above, the instant petition is allowed. The interim order dated 24.2.2026, passed by this Court is hereby confirmed, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any



other incident that involves commission of an offence.

7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

24.3.2026
Ashwani

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