



CRM-M-14912-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

111

**CRM-M-14912-2026
Decided on: 18.03.2026**

LOVEPREET SINGH**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate with
Mr. Navjyot Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Anavi Parnami, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhijeet Chaudhary, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.454 dated 01.12.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 303(2) of Bharatiya Nayaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal, Haryana.

2. Briefly stated, the present case has been registered on the complaint of Manager (Administration), Modern Dairies Limited, Shamgarh, Karnal wherein allegations were made regarding manipulation of weighbridge data by co-accused namely, Rajiv Kumar (the weighment Operator) and Dushyant (SAP Operator) while on duty on 07.11.2025. They allegedly recorded incorrect weight of milk tanker vehicles, bypassed gate procedure, prepared fake weight slips by forging signature



of the security guard. CCTV footage and mobile phone transactions of co-accused namely, Rajiv Kumar allegedly showed suspicious dealings with tanker drivers and conversations with co-employees. During inquiry, co-accused Rajiv Kumar admitted preparing a fake slip, whereas co-accused-Dushyant fled from duty. However, the allegations against the present petitioner is that there is a direct transaction of the petitioner with the co-accused Rajiv and the petitioner had sent total amount of Rs.11,41,500/- vide different transactions in the accounts of co-accused Rajiv, Gurpreet and Jagjeet.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as he is not named in the present FIR; there is a delay of more than 03 weeks in lodging of the FIR. It is further contended that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis that certain electronic payments were made from the petitioner bank accounts or the accounts of his two firms to the accused namely, Rajiv Kumar who was an employee of the complainant Company. It is also contended that the petitioner never visited any area to collect the milk and the milk was brought to the firms of the petitioner for sale which he had purchased and made payment either through cash or electronic mode; the complainant's firm is situated in District Karnal whereas that of the petitioner is at Pehowa, District Kurukshetra and there is a considerable distance between the



premises of the complainant as well as that of the petitioner as the petitioner has never visited the premises of the complainant.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that co-accused Rajiv (employee of Modern Diaries) received an amount of Rs.24,000/- from the account of the petitioner, Rs.4,13,500/- from the account of Khalsa Milk as well as Rs.3,76,000/- from Gurunanak Dairy and the petitioner is the proprietor of the said plant/ dairy; the petitioner purchased milk by coming to place other than his own dairy and made monetary transactions directly to the employees of the Modern Dairies; as such, the petitioner is directly involved in the alleged offence. Learned counsel further contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present matter to collect the evidence and for recovery purposes. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking anticipatory bail.

6. Mr. Abhijeet Chaudhary, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant by way of filing of Power of Attorney and submits that the petitioner is directly involved in the commission of the alleged offence, as certain transactions have been made from the account of the present petitioner.

7. Heard.



8. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case and the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties, the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature as he was directly involved in purchasing of the stolen milk; the Court does not find merit in the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner was unaware that he was purchasing stolen milk as he purchased milk at place other than his dairy farm/ shop and transferred money for the same to the account of erring employees of the Modern Diaries; certain transactions made to the accounts of the co-accused namely Rajiv and Dushyan show the complicity of the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence as he had made the good on the deficiency, as such the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the modus operandi in the present case, as well as for recovery purpose. In *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. Keeping in view the gravity of offence and the role assigned to the present petitioner, the petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for and the present petition is hereby **dismissed**.



CRM-M-14912-2026 (O&M) -5-

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

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO