



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

205

CRM-M-9268-2026

Date of Decision: 30.03.2026

**SUKHDEEP SINGH**

...Petitioner

Versus

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Hardik Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short-‘BNSS’) by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.263 dated 27.12.2025, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Sadar Khanna, District Khanna.
2. Vide order dated 17.02.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted interim bail and was directed to join investigation.
3. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has submitted that the petitioner joined the investigation on 25.02.2026 but has not fully cooperated. It is, however, submitted in the reply as well as by learned State counsel that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the complete chain of conspiracy between the petitioner and the co-accused, and to ascertain the exact role played by the petitioner and verify the financial trail



etc. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner does not deserve to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner has already joined the investigation, custodial interrogation is not required. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard rival submission made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Though, it is submitted by learned State counsel that the petitioner has not cooperated with the investigating agency concerned, however, in the considered opinion of this Court, mere non disclosure of identity of co-accused and owner of vehicle cannot itself be a ground for denial of bail as has also been observed by the Delhi High Court in case titled as '*Jagdish Thakur vs. State of Delhi*', 1992(3) CCR 2764' and in case titled as '*Pooran Singh vs. State of Delhi*', 2022(1) RCR (Criminal) 503. So far as the contention that the petitioner has not cooperated in the investigation concerned, it may be stated that the behaviour attributed to the petitioner cannot be considered as an instance of non-cooperation, justifying denial for grant of pre arrest bail, since, an accused, while joining investigation, is not expected to make self incriminating statement under the threat that the State may seek withdrawal of the interim protection granted to him. The purpose of joining investigation is to make oneself available to the Investigating Agency and to respond to lawful queries and not to divulge self-incriminating information.

7. In view of the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and given the nature of allegations, this Court is of the opinion

that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. As such, without commenting on merits of case, this petition is allowed and the order dated 17.02.2026 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

March 30, 2026  
*Nisha-1*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |