



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
203
CRM-M-21172-2026
Decided on : 01.05.2026

Diljit Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab and another . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Arshdeep S. Khaira, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Diljit Singh, aged about 29 years	185	17.10.2025	S. 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) & 61(2) of BNS, 2023 [corresponding S. 420, 465, 467, 468,471 & 120-B of IPC]	Salem Tabri	Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana

2. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 28.04.2026, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

3. In the present case, on 20.04.2026, following order was passed:-

“2. On receipt of secret information, ASI Major Singh reported



that one Ram Kumar is allegedly engaged in duping gullible persons visiting Civil Hospital, Ludhiana, by misleading them into obtaining fake dope test reports, for which he, along with his associates, charges exorbitant amounts.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no individual has come forward to lodge any complaint, nor any alleged victim surfaced claiming to have suffered on account of any such fake dope test report prepared by the main accused-Ram Kumar. It is contended that FIR has been registered merely on suspicion, without any substantive material on record.*

It is further submitted that petitioner is neither engaged in any business relating to preparation of seals or documents, nor he is connected in any manner with Civil Hospital, Ludhiana. Petitioner is also not acquainted with, nor has any nexus with, the named accused-Ram Kumar, and has been falsely implicated in the present case.

Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, in case, he is granted protection from arrest by this Court. Thus, a prayer has been made for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent—State and, on instructions from ASI Major Singh, submits that co-accused Ram Kumar and Avtar have already been arrested in the present case. It is informed that certain forged dope test reports, along with seals used for affixing stamps on such reports, were recovered from them.*

It is further submitted that, in the disclosure statement of Ram Kumar, name of the petitioner has surfaced, with the allegation that it was the petitioner who got the tampered/forged seal prepared for use in the preparation of fake dope test reports.

However, in order to place on record the material connecting the petitioner with the alleged offence, learned State counsel seeks time to file a detailed status report in the matter.

6. *Adjourned to 01.05.2026.*

7. *Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.”*

4. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that except for the disclosure statement of co-accused – Ram Kumar, there is no material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. It is contended that as per the said disclosure statement, it was Ram Kumar who used to prepare fake stamps of doctors and senior medical officers of Civil Hospital, Ludhiana, allegedly upon receiving payment.

It is further submitted that since recovery of the alleged fake stamps has already been effected from co-accused – Ram Kumar, the



implication of the petitioner solely on the basis of such disclosure statement would not be sufficient to establish his involvement.

Thus, it is argued that in the given circumstances, the petitioner ought not to be subjected to custodial interrogation, and he is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner has been specifically named during the course of investigation. There are specific allegations regarding the participation of the accused persons, including the petitioner, and the investigation is still at a crucial stage.

It is further submitted that in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage, it may adversely affect the investigation, and there is every likelihood of his influencing witnesses or tampering with prosecution evidence. Accordingly, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petition.

However, other factual assertions made here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the status report filed by learned State counsel.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case; the nature of allegations; and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation



within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 01, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*