



105

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

**CRM-M-33134-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 16.03.2026**

YADWINDER SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. S.S. Swaich, Advocate, and
Mr. Gurminder Singh Salana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab, along with
DSP Tejinder Pal Singh, Vigilance Bureau,
Rupnagar (Present IO),
Mr. Manik Setia, Assistant Financial Officer,
Vigilance Bureau, HQ,
SI Sandeep Kaur, Vigilance Bureau, Fatehgarh Sahib.

Ms. Isha Aggarwal, Advocate, for
Mr. Simrandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.44, dated 04.04.2025, under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61 of BNS, registered at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 23.06.2025, following order was passed:-

"2. The facts of the case are that an amount of Rs.52 crores was deposited into the bank account of the Gram Panchayat as sale proceeds from the

transfer/sale of approximately 130 acres of Panchayat land to the Punjab Small Scale Industrial Corporation in May 2020. At the relevant time, Smt. Kulvir Kaur (mother of the present petitioner) was the Sarpanch. Subsequently, the petitioner assumed the office of Sarpanch of the village in November 2024.

The allegation against the petitioner is that, during the period when his mother held charge as Sarpanch, it was the petitioner who was actively involved in all the activities of the Gram Panchayat. He is alleged to have been involved in the embezzlement of approximately Rs.30 crores.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and made a scapegoat, despite the fact that the funds were utilized only after obtaining the requisite sanctions, and the accounts/transactions for the relevant years were duly audited by a government agency. It is further contended that if any embezzlement took place prior to the petitioner's formally assuming office in November 2024, he cannot be held responsible for the same. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the authorities, and hence, seeks the grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. Adjourned to 10.07.2025.

5. Learned State counsel is directed to file a detailed status report, indicating the direct or indirect involvement of the petitioner in causing loss to the Panchayat funds.

6. Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner's joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.

7. To be shown in the urgent list."

3. During the pendency of the present petition, certain graver offences under the special statute, i.e. Prevention of Corruption Act, have been invoked by the prosecution. Consequently, an application bearing No.CRM-11548-2026 for addition of the said offences, i.e. Sections

316(4), 318 and 61(2) of the BNS (corresponding to Sections 408, 415 and 120-B of the IPC) and Section 13(1)(b) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, has been moved by the petitioner, which is also listed for hearing today.

4. Learned State counsel submits that in view of the provisions of the Prevention of Corruption Act now invoked by the State, petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. It is further submitted that anticipatory bail petition filed by the co-accused, namely Ramesh Kumar, who was functioning as BDPO, has already been dismissed, vide order dated 12.03.2026 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib.

A copy of the said order has been produced by learned State counsel before the Court and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

7. In the considered view of this Court, petitioner ought to have first sought the concession of anticipatory bail in respect of the offences now invoked under the Prevention of Corruption Act, before the Court of Sessions. Thereafter, in case of failure, petitioner could have approached this Court, by filing an appropriate petition incorporating all the relevant provisions and factual aspects.

8. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition, with liberty to the petitioner to move an anticipatory

bail petition afresh before the Court of Sessions, by explaining all the relevant circumstances and the provisions of law, under which the allegations have been levelled against him by the prosecution.

Upon such filing, the Court concerned shall pass a speaking order after examining the record produced by the prosecution and considering the factual aspects of the matter.

9. **Meanwhile, in order to enable the petitioner to approach the Court of Sessions as indicated above, it is directed that petitioner shall not be arrested, till 23.03.2026.**

10. However, it is clarified that in case, petitioner files an application for anticipatory bail before the Court of Sessions, the question of grant of interim relief, if any, shall be considered by the said Court, in accordance with law.

11. With the directions passed here above, present petition stands disposed of.

16.03.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>