



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

215

**CRM-M No.20297 of 2026
Date of decision : 20.4.2026
Date of uploading : 20.4.2026**

Chetan Gupta**.....Petitioner****Versus****Central Bureau of Investigation through its Director****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Parashar, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Prateek Gupta, Special Public Prosecutor, for CBI

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in FIR No. RC0052025A0021 dated 18.12.2025, registered under Section 120-B read with Sections 406, 409, 420, 471 of IPC and Section 131-A read with Section 132 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018), at Police Station CBI, ACB, Chandigarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner was merely working as Lower Division Clerk on contractual basis and was transferred to Accounts Branch in the



month of August, 2021. Learned counsel has further argued that in order to save the real culprits, small contractual employees, including the petitioner, were made scapegoat. Learned counsel has further argued that entire case is based on documentary evidence.

2.1. Learned counsel has further submitting that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation. On the basis of the aforementioned submissions, grant of the instant petition is prayed for.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the responden – CBI, while raising submissions in tandem with counter affidavit dated 24.01.2026 filed in CRM-M No.1550 of 2026, has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that, in case, the petitioner is accorded concession of anticipatory bail, there is all likelihood that he may abscond from the process of justice as also attempt to influence the prosecution witnesses. Thus, the present petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed. Learned counsel has, however, submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner, at present, is not required.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

5. Relevant of the counter affidavit dated 24.01.2026 reads thus:

“Clarification on Custodial Interrogation

12. That the expression “custodial interrogation may be required”, as used in the reply filed by CBI before the Ld. Special



Court, was intended to convey a contingent investigative requirement, dependent upon the emergence of further facts, evidence, or recovery during the course of investigation.

13. That as on date, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not being sought. However, the Investigating Agency reserves its right to seek custodial interrogation at a later stage, if warrants by subsequent developments during the course of investigation or discovery of fresh incriminating material.”

5.1. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and considering the overall facts and circumstances; especially keeping in view the nature of allegations against the petitioner, the case appearing to be primarily based on documentary evidence and specific stand of the respondent– CBI that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not, presently, sought for; this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the petition in hand is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his joining investigation and cooperating therein, as and when required, and further subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly influence any witness or tamper with the evidence.

7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.



8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

20.4.2026
Ashwanii

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