

CRM-M-18811-2026

-1-

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18811-2026

Decided on: 07.04.2026

Harpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Manvinder Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.56 dated 22.02.2026, registered under Sections 309(6) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Kalan Wali, Police District Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ranjeet Singh. It was alleged that on 13.02.2026, he took Rs.30,000/- from Maninder Singh and went to the Shivratri fair in village Jagmalwali. People were playing cards in the fields. One Shambhu, whom he already knew was standing there. They suspected that the complainant might file a complaint, but Shambhu pacified them. In evening at about 07:30 p.m., when the complainant was going on his motorcycle, Honey Singh and another boy who was with him started riding alongside him on their motorcycle. When they reached Taruana Trilokewala, a boy came behind on his motorcycle and collided with the complainant's motorcycle. Honey Singh and another boy also stopped their motorcycle and started beating him and snatched his bag which contained Rs.30,000/-, documents, purse and his phone and fled away on their motorcycles. He was shifted to the hospital. Thus, request was made

to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the

FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and he was also arrayed as an accused. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa praying for grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 30.03.2026. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that neither the petitioner has been named in the FIR nor any role has been attributed to him. He contends that the petitioner was never identified by the complainant either by name or by face. However, he has been falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is not even an admissible evidence. He further contends that there is an unexplained delay of nine days in lodging the FIR, as the occurrence took place on 13.02.2026, whereas, the FIR was registered on 22.02.2026. He has contended that in the FIR, three persons were mentioned by the complainant, however, five persons have been arrested in this case, thus, false implication of the petitioner in the present case is writ large. He contends that in the fact and circumstances of the present case, no case as alleged against the petitioner is made out and thus, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that in a well

planned conspiracy hatched by the petitioner alongwith the co-accused, he committed robbery of Rs.30,000/-, documents, mobile phone on the complainant and also gave beatings to him. He submits that during the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced. He submits that the investigation is at the initial stage and to recover the looted money, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. He, thus, submits that the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court finds no merit in the present petition. The allegations against the petitioner relate to his involvement in a well-planned robbery, which resulted in the loss of cash, documents, and personal belongings of the complainant and injuries caused to him. The investigation is still at an initial stage, and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to recover the looted property and for further inquiry. *Prima facie* the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Considering the nature and circumstances of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner, and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

482“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*

2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

- (i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- (ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."*

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State represented by CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

"6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under [Section 438](#) if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disintering many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in task of

disintering offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8. Hon’ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, AIR 1980 SC 1632, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary circumstances.

9. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

10. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in her favour. Resultantly, the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

11. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.04.2026
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No