

2026:PHHC:086456



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

103

CRM-M-30361-2026

Date of decision: 2nd June, 2026

Rajveer Singh @ Rahul

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 70 dated 29.04.2026 registered under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 304 and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Division No.4, Ludhiana.

2. The aforesaid FIR has been registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Amarjit Singh, on 04.04.2026, alleging therein that he was engaged in the wholesale business of gold ornaments. The present petitioner and his father used to purchase ready-made

2026:PHHC:086456



gold ornaments from his shop at Ludhiana and used to sell the same in retail. Since long, he had business dealings with them. They used to take ready-made ornaments from him or his son on credit basis from time to time. They had taken 5 kilograms and 35 grams of gold ornaments from him on different dates, but thereafter their intention became dishonest and they started avoiding payment of the amount of the gold ornaments. They stopped responding to the phone calls made by the complainant and also did not return the gold ornaments. When the complainant threatened to initiate legal action against the petitioner and his father, they started extending threats to the complainant. On 05.03.2026, they manhandled the complainant and also snatched 200 grams of gold ornaments which the complainant was carrying with him for the purpose of delivering the same to some of his customers. As such, the complainant prayed for taking action against the culprits. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which was disposed of by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, vide order dated 08.05.2026, calling upon the Investigating Officer to adhere to the provisions of Section 35 of the BNSS. Thereafter, the present petition has been filed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. The story of snatching of 200 grams of gold ornaments and non-payment of the amount of the gold ornaments allegedly taken from the complainant is totally false and concocted. He has not been served with any notice under Section 35 of the BNSS. His custodial

2026:PHHC:086456



interrogation is not required and no recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. He is pursuing his undergraduate course and has to appear in his examinations. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. For the purpose of conducting thorough investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is required. Notice under Section 35 of BNSS has been issued against the petitioner on 19.05.2026 and the petitioner did not comply with the same. There is no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance for grant of anticipatory bail to him. It is, therefore argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused who is his father, is alleged to have not paid the amount for the purchase of 5 kilograms and 35 grams of gold ornaments from the complainant on different dates. As per the allegations, on 05.03.2026, he snatched 200 grams of gold ornaments from the complainant. Learned State counsel, on checking from the police file, has submitted that the receipt regarding handing over of some gold ornaments by the complainant to the police forms part of the police file. For the purpose of conducting thorough investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Even otherwise, the petitioner has failed to make out

2026:PHHC:086456



any exceptional or extraordinary circumstance for grant of pre-arrest bail to him. It is well settled that anticipatory bail to an accused can be granted in exceptional circumstances only as a person couched in comparative safety of pre-arrest bail would certainly not disclose all the facts within his knowledge. In case custodial interrogation of the petitioner is denied to the Investigating Agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

2nd June, 2026
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes / No
2. Whether reportable

:

Yes / No