



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

207

CRM-M-32986-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.01.2026

Shivraj Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. S.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

Ms. Satinder Kaur, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.41 dated 12.03.2025, registered under Section 420, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Baghapurana, District Moga.

2. On 20.11.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.41 dated 12.03.2025, registered under Section 420, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Baghapurana, District Moga.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that he has been falsely implicated. The FIR has been registered with the allegations that the complainant's son was desirous of going to Canada and he contacted the petitioner through some mediator namely Shera, who had told the complainant that the daughter of the petitioner has got 7 bands IELTS and she is going to Canada on study visa and if they marry the complainant's son with petitioner's daughter and spend some money around Rs.20,50,000/-, she will take complainant's son to Canada. Learned counsel further contended that thereafter some payments were made in the account of the petitioner and his daughter and she had gone to Canada after marrying the son of the complainant. Thereafter, she applied

for visa of the complainant's son but the visa was rejected by the Canadian authorities and neither petitioner nor his daughter are at fault and infact marriage is still subsisting. The false allegations have been levelled in the FIR that the petitioner and his daughter have cheated the complainant. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and he be released on bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that complainant has spent about Rs.25,00,000/- in the marriage as well as for sending petitioner's daughter to Canada but thereafter, she has started ignoring the complainant's son and has refused to take him to Canada. In view of the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Adjourned to 08.12.2025.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of their arrest, he shall be admitted to adinterim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under subsection(3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that Section. ”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jaswant Rai affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the

investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 20.11.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

20.01.2026
M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No