



111 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22106-2026
Date of decision: 22.04.2026

RAMANDEEP SINGH SIDHU @ RAMANDIP SINGH SIDHU

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Gurmeet Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0211 dated 13.12.2022 registered under Section 379 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Section 21 of Mines and Mineral (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (Sections 353, 186 & 506 of IPC added vide DDR No.043 dated 02.01.2023) at Police Station Makhu, District Ferozepur.

2. Briefly stated, upon receiving secret information to the effect that illegal mining is being carried out on *panchayat* land of village Khandoor and sand was being loaded into the trolleys for transportation, the mining officer went at the spot for checking. The petitioner was found present at the spot, and on inquiry, he intentionally disclosed his wrong identity by disclosing his name as 'Randeep Singh'. Further, it is alleged that the petitioner fled away from the spot with loaded tractor trolly. Hence, the present FIR was registered.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case due to the reason that he is the Sarpanch of the village Khandoor, and his father is Ex-Sarpanch of the village; name of the petitioner has not been mentioned in the FIR; co-accused, namely Parson Singh Sidhu @ Parshan Singh Sidhu i.e. father of the petitioner has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.08.2023 passed in **CRM-M No.22448 of 2023**; the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation as nothing is to be recovered from him and he is ready to join investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency. As such, learned counsel prayed for relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner intentionally furnished incorrect identity as 'Randeep Singh' to the Mining Officer, and when the officer informed the police, the petitioner fled away from the spot with tractor trolley loaded with sand; mining was carried out in the *panchayat* land; the petitioner is not having clean and clear antecedents and is involved in two more cases and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for investigation purpose. As such, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the allegations levelled against the petitioner and taking into consideration the seriousness of offence, it transpires that the petitioner was seen present at the spot by the Mining Officer; illegal mining was being carried out in the *panchayat* land; the petitioner intentionally disclosed his name as 'Randeep



Singh’, hence, he tried to evade the investigation; the petitioner does not share parity with the co-accused, who has been granted anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, as he is not having clean and clear antecedents and is involved in two more cases; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for proper investigation of the case, hence, this Court is of the view that petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail in view of the foregoing discussion.

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as ‘*CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997*, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, rather than from a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. So, taking into consideration the totality of circumstances, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

April 22, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |