

2026:PHHC:031381



110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22929-2024

Bhagwan Dass

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of Decision: February 26, 2026

Date of Uploading: February 26, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG Punjab.

None for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. seeking grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.224 dated 21.11.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, 1860, at Police Station Division No.8, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

2. On 18.07.2024, the following order was passed:

“As the SIT is investigating the matter, I deem it appropriate to permit the petitioner to join investigation.

List on 31.07.2024.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation on 20.07.2024 and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;

- ii) *that the petitioner 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) *that the petitioner shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his passport, if any.”*

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from Inspector Amritpal Singh) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation repeatedly. He has further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required except for the fact that whereabouts of co-accused, namely, Abhishek Goyal, who is son of the present petitioner, are required to be ascertained from the petitioner and the said co-accused is on run, and his proclamation already stands issued.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially nature of the dispute/ issue in the FIR in question, the petitioner having been extended concession of interim bail on 18.07.2024, which is enuring till date, nothing brought forth that the petitioner has misused the said concession, the petitioner having joined investigation repeatedly; this Court is inclined to confirm the interim order dated 18.07.2024 passed by this Court, and the same is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) of Cr. P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

5. Petition stands allowed, accordingly.

6. 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.

7. 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 438(2) of Cr. P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 26, 2026

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No