



112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13567-2026
Date of decision: 12.03.2026

SATNAM SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Vijay Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Rakesh Kaundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.259 dated 20.09.2025 registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 351(2) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 24 of Emigration Act, 1983 (*wrongly mentioned as 'Immigration Act' in the head note as well as prayer clause*) at Police Station Mulana, District Ambala.

2. Briefly stated, the accused persons, namely Devinder Singh, Kamaljit Singh @ Billu, Balbir Singh @ Bhira, wife of Balbir Singh (name not known) and **Satnam Singh (petitioner herein)** duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.70,00,000/- on the pretext of sending his son abroad. When complainant's son was on his way, the accused persons repeatedly extorted additional sums of money, and when complainant finally refused and said that



he would report the accused persons to police, then they extended threats that if complainant approached the police, his son would be killed. Thereafter on 18.07.2025, complainant's son Harshpreet was deported by the U.S. Administration. Hence, the FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case; there is no specific allegation against the petitioner in the present FIR; the allegation levelled against the petitioner is that he was present amongst the accused when complainant gave money for sending his son abroad; the petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case; the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation as nothing is to be recovered from him and he is ready to join investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency. As such, learned counsel prayed for relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery purpose as well as to collect evidence for the success of the prosecution case and prayed for dismissal of present petition.

5. Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his memo of appearance. Learned counsel opposed the prayer made by petitioner and submitted that huge amount has been duped from the complainant, who is a farmer by profession and paid the amount after selling his land; son of the complainant was also kept in illegal confinement and money was extorted from the complainant from time to time; the petitioner has actively participated in commission of offence; at the first instance, the petitioner was accompanying the co-accused and they introduced



him as their partner and even money was also transferred in the account of petitioner as beneficiary. Hence, learned counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the contentions of learned counsel for the parties that the petitioner has actively participated in commission of offence as his name is figured in the FIR; specific role has been attributed to the petitioner that he was partner of co-accused to send son of the complainant abroad and huge amount of Rs.70,00,000/- has been received from the complainant on the pretext of sending his son abroad and allegedly, petitioner is also the beneficiary of part of the money received, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery purpose as well as to collect evidence to conduct a proper investigation. Accordingly, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806***' decided on 03.08.1997, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, rather than from a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned

trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

March 12, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |