



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

203

CRM-M-15230-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Swaranjeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present : Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate for the complainant.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.307 dated 22.12.2025 under Section 64, 3(5) BNS of 2023 (corresponding Section 376 and 34 IPC), registered at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits submit that present prosecution is not a genuine criminal proceedings but is the result of a carefully orchestrated scheme, allegedly in the nature of a "honey trap", designed to extort money from the petitioner. It is contended that unlawful demands were initially raised for a sum of Rs.5 lakhs and were thereafter escalated to Rs. 40 lakhs. It is further argued that the sequence of events



between 11.12.2025 and 22.12.2025, as projected by the prosecution, is inherently improbable and does not inspire confidence.

3. It has been submitted that the complainant allegedly misrepresented her identity and induced the petitioner to meet under false pretences, whereafter he was subjected to threats, intimidation and physical assault, compelling him to transfer an amount of Rs.63,000/- and also depriving him of his personal belongings. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner, in fact, is a victim and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

4. It is further argued that there is no material on record to substantiate the allegations levelled in the FIR and that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Consequently, custodial interrogation is not required. It is also submitted that the petitioner is a young individual and his implication in such a case would cause serious prejudice to his reputation and future prospects.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that, having regard to the gravity and nature of the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail.

6. During the course of arguments, the complainant, through counsel, appeared before this Court and categorically stated that the dispute between the parties stands amicably resolved and that she does not wish to pursue the complaint. She has further conveyed that she has no objection to



the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material available on record.

8. At this stage, the veracity of the allegations as well as the defence sought to be projected by the petitioner are matters to be tested during the course of trial. The scope of consideration in a petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is confined to examining whether custodial interrogation is warranted and whether the petitioner's liberty deserves protection in the facts and circumstances of the case.

9. A perusal of the record would show that the allegations primarily stem from an interaction between the parties, the broad contours whereof are already within the knowledge of the investigating agency. It is not the case of the prosecution that any recovery remains to be effected from the petitioner or that his custodial interrogation is indispensable for the purposes of investigation. In the absence of any such compelling circumstance, arrest cannot be justified as a matter of course.

10. Equally significant is the subsequent development during the course of hearing, wherein the complainant, through counsel, has appeared before this Court and has categorically stated that the dispute *inter se* the parties stands amicably resolved and that she does not wish to pursue the complaint, while also expressing no objection to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Though such a statement does not efface the allegations contained in the FIR, it is a relevant circumstance which bears directly upon



the necessity of custodial interrogation.

11 In the totality of the circumstances, particularly the nature of allegations, absence of any specific requirement of custodial interrogation, and the stand taken by the complainant before this Court, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has been able to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed

13. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when required and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., including that he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case.

14. It is, however, clarified that in case the petitioner fails to cooperate with the investigation or violates any of the conditions imposed upon him, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.

15. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of

30.04.2026

Atul

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

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