



CRM-M-14138-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.107

CRM-M-14138-2026
Date of Decision: 13.03.2026

UPKAR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Viren Sibal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 34 dated 27.02.2026, registered under Sections 316(2), 314, 221 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 406, 403, 186 and 506 of the IPC) at Police Station Maqsudan, District Jalandhar Rural.
2. The brief facts of the case are that the present FIR has been registered on the basis of a complaint made by the District Controller, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Department, Jalandhar alleging that a substantial quantity of government wheat belonging to the Central Pool was stored in the cold storage/godown of J.S. Farm, Sarmastpur, owned by the present petitioner. When the officials of the department visited the premises to conduct inspection and verify the wheat bags stored in the godown, the petitioner allegedly refused to cooperate and obstructed the officials from performing their official duties. It has further been alleged that



the petitioner falsely claimed ownership over the government wheat stored in the premises and dishonestly retained the same, thereby raising apprehension regarding misappropriation of government property.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State.

5. Mr. Iqbal Singh Saggu, Advocate and Mr. Tejveer Singh Saggu, Advocate have made appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed Power of Attorney, which is taken on record.

6. Learned State counsel with the assistance of learned counsel for the complainant has contested the present bail application on the ground that a huge quantity of government wheat involving a substantial amount is involved in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner deliberately obstructed the government officials from discharging their official duties when they visited the cold storage premises to inspect the wheat bags stored there. It is further argued that the petitioner dishonestly retained the government wheat and falsely claimed ownership over the same, thereby *prima facie* attracting the offence of criminal breach of trust. According to the State, the conduct of the petitioner clearly reflects his dishonest intention to misappropriate government property and to cause wrongful loss to the State exchequer. On these grounds, it has been submitted that the petitioner does not deserve the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered view that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The material placed on record *prima*



facie indicates that a substantial quantity of government wheat belonging to the State was stored in the premises under the control of the petitioner and when the competent authorities attempted to inspect the same, the petitioner allegedly obstructed them from performing their official duties. The allegations also suggest that the petitioner falsely claimed ownership over the government stock and dishonestly retained the same, thereby giving rise to a strong *prima facie* inference of dishonest intention to misappropriate government property involving a substantial financial implication.

8. The nature of allegations, the gravity of the offence and the role attributed to the petitioner do not persuade this Court to extend the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail. Grant of such relief at this stage may adversely affect the investigation and the collection of material evidence in the matter.

9. Accordingly, the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail is dismissed.

10. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

13.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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