



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

289-2

CRM-M-12425-2026

MANPREET SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 30.04.2026

Date of uploading: 30.04.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. ORAL

1. On 20.03.2026, the following order was passed:-

Apprehending his arrest in FIR No. 151 dated 07.07.2020, under Sections 447, 511, 427, 506, 34 IPC (Sections 329(3), 62, 324(4), 351 (2) & (3), 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023 (Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023), registered at P.S. Division No. 5, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question, a similarly placed coaccused namely Vaneet Goyal has already acquitted vide order dated 04.10.2025 passed by the concerned trial Court, the order declaring the petitioner as proclaimed offender is stayed by this Court vide order of even date i.e. 20.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-12450-2026 & the petitioner is willing to appear before concerned trial Court and face trial.

Notice of motion.

On the strength of advance notice; Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.



*At this stage; Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his power of attorney.
List on 28.04.2026. To be heard alongwith CRM-M-12450-2026.
The petitioner is directed to appear before the concerned trial Court on 25.03.2026 and, upon his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the said Court”*

- 2. Learned counsel for the rival parties are *ad idem* that the petitioner has appeared before the concerned Court.
- 3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has urged that the petitioner shall continue to appear before the concerned Court and face the trial in accordance with law.
- 4. Learned State counsel, as also learned counsel for the complainant, have opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, contending that the petitioner had earlier absconded and, in case the concession of anticipatory bail is extended to him, there is every likelihood that he may abscond again.
- 5. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and keeping in view the entirety of the factual milieu of the case in hand, the interim order dated 20.03.2026 is made absolute, subject to the petitioner continuing to appear before the trial Court in accordance with law and facing trial.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

30.04.2026
jatin

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