



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

207

CRM-M-16586-2026

Date of decision : 30.04.2026

PARDEEP SINGH

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Ajay Pratap Singh Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Thind, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasmeet Singh Ghumman, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH. J.(Oral)

1. This petition for pre-arrest bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.252 dated 24.10.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Police Station Division 8, Jalandhar Police Commissionerate.

2. Mr. Jasmeet Singh Ghumman, Advocate appears on behalf of complainant. He has filed Power of Attorney. The same be taken on record.

3. Vide order dated 25.03.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 25.03.2026, the petitioner has joined the investigation, and that for further investigation of the petitioner custodial interrogation is not required. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the entire evidence to be collected by the Investigating Agency is documentary in nature, and therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to be produced any fruitful result.

5. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the order dated 25.03.2026 be made absolute.

6. In response to above-mentioned arguments, learned State Counsel, (on the instructions of ASI Pardeep Kumar) being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has come forward with a plea that the petitioner was not cooperative during the course of investigation, and that the whereabouts of his co-accused have not been disclosed by the petitioner.

7. In view of above, the learned State counsel has requested that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and the present petition deserves dismissal.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner on the instructions of petitioner has contended that the co-accused 'Ramandeep' is presently settled in Canada, and that the last known address of

‘Ramandeep’ can be provided by the petitioner. He has assured to provide the same within two weeks.

9. The record has been perused carefully.
10. In view of the fact that nothing has to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby observed that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to be produced any fruitful result. Thus, the order dated 25.03.2026 is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

30.04.2026
vipin

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No