



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

118

CRM-M-11109-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 22.04.2026

Bikramjeet Singh Gill ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Vrishank Suri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

CRM-16453-2026

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the additional affidavit of applicant/petitioner annexed with the application is taken on record as Annexure A-1 subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-11109-2026

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS seeking directions to respondents No.2 to 4 not to harass the petitioner by way of illegal visits to his house and also by not making repeated phone calls to visit the police station.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner had earlier filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, apprehending his wrongful implication



CRM-M-11109-2026 (O&M)

(2)

in a false complaint allegedly initiated at Police Station Rampura Phull, Bathinda at the instance of one Happy, owner of Krishna Dairy. It is contended that the said complaint pertains to alleged theft of ghee involving one Manpreet Singh, and that the present petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the said dairy or its owner. The petitioner is neither a customer, employee, nor a business partner of the said dairy. It is further contended that the aforesaid anticipatory bail application was dismissed as withdrawn in view of the statement made by ASI Jagtar Singh to the effect that the petitioner, namely Bikramjeet Singh @ Gilla, is not required by the police of Police Station City Rampura in any case and that no FIR has been registered against him. However, despite the said statement, police officials are allegedly making repeated visits to the petitioner's residence and contacting him telephonically to join investigation in a matter which does not exist, thereby causing unnecessary harassment. Thus, learned counsel prays that the petitioner be protected from harassment and that no action in derogation of law be taken against him.

3. Learned State counsel submitted that the police officials visited the petitioner's residence only for the purpose of enquiry and to ensure proper investigation of the case.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the paper book, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the investigating agency to act strictly in accordance with law. In the event the petitioner is not required in the present



CRM-M-11109-2026 (O&M) (3)

case and there is no material indicating his involvement, no coercive steps shall be taken against him and he shall not be subjected to unnecessary harassment. However, it is clarified that if any material surfaces during the course of investigation indicating the involvement of the petitioner, the investigating agency shall be at liberty to proceed against him in accordance with law.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

22.04.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No