



101

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

**CRM-M-33461-2026
DECIDED ON: 11.06.2026**

SUCHA SINGH**.....PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER****.....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG Punjab

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under section 439(2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of anticipatory bail to granted by the Session Court order dated 30.04.2026 case no. BA- 606-2026(Annexure P-3) to the accused| Prabhjot Kaur) in case FIR No. 16 dated 07.03.2026, under Sections 303(2) BNS (Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) old section (379 IPC) registered at Police Station Dhilwan,Kapurthala, Punjab (Annexure P-1), in the interest of justice & fair play.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-complainant contends that respondent No. 2/accused obtained anticipatory bail despite serious allegations of theft and unauthorized transfer of funds. It is argued that, as per the FIR and the material collected during inquiry, the accused allegedly removed 28–30 tolas of gold from the complainant's house and transferred an amount of ₹7,36,900/- from the accounts of the complainant and his wife to the joint account maintained by the accused and her husband by using their mobile phones. It is further submitted



that the transferred amount was subsequently withdrawn/transacted through UPI and the recovery of the stolen gold and misappropriated money is yet to be effected. Learned counsel asserts that custodial interrogation of the accused is necessary for effecting recovery and unearthing the complete *modus operandi*, and therefore the order granting anticipatory bail suffers from illegality and deserves to be set aside in the interest of justice.

3. Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice has neither supported the case of the petitioner so as to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent nor opposed the prayer.

4. Heard counsel for the respective parties.

5. Before considering the contentions raised in this petition, certain principles, which govern the grant of anticipatory bail, are required to be noticed.

In ***Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State (NCT of Delhi)***, (2020) 5 SCC 1, the Supreme Court has enunciated the considerations that must govern the grant of anticipatory by holding as under: -

92.3...While considering an application (for grant of anticipatory bail) the court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence (including intimidating witnesses), likelihood of fleeing justice (such as leaving the country), etc.

92.4. Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a matter of discretion; equally whether and if so, what kind of special conditions are to be imposed (or not imposed) are dependent on facts of the case, and subject to the discretion of the court.”

6. Similarly, in ***Neeru Yadav Vs. State of UP & Anr.***, (2016) 15 SCC 422, it was held by Supreme Court as under: -



“11. It is the duty of the Court to take into consideration certain factors and they basically are, (i) the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in cases of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence, (ii) reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witnesses for apprehension of threat to the complainant, and (iii) Prima facie satisfaction of the court in support of the charge.”

7. Proceeding ahead, there can be no doubt that all the aforesaid factors are required to be taken into consideration while granting anticipatory bail to an accused, but it is a well-established principle that once bail has been granted, it would require cogent and overwhelming circumstances for its cancellation. At the same time, equally important is to note that bail can be revoked by the superior court, if the court granting bail has ignored relevant material available on record, as observed by the Supreme Court in **“Vipan Kumar Dhir Vs. State of Punjab 2021 SCC OnLine SC 854”**.

8. In **State Through Delhi Administration vs Sanjay Gandhi, 1978 AIR 961**, it has been observed by the Apex Court that:

“Rejection of bail when bail is applied for is one thing; cancellation of bail already granted is quite another. It is easier to reject a bail application in a non-bailable case than to cancel a bail granted in such a case. Cancellation of bail necessarily involves the review of a decision already made and can by and large be permitted only if, by reason of supervening circumstances, it would be no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom during the trial.”

9. In **Ms. X vs The State of Telangana (2018) 16 SCC 511**, Hon’ble Supreme Court held that:

“In a consistent line of precedent this Court has emphasised the distinction between the rejection of bail in a non-bailable case at the initial stage and the cancellation of bail after it has been granted. In adverting to the



*distinction, a Bench of two learned Judges of this Court in **Dolatram v State of Haryana [(1995) 1 SCC 349]** observed that:*

“Rejection of a bail in a non-bailable case at the initial stage and the cancellation of bail so granted, have to be considered and dealt with on different basis. Very cogent and overwhelming circumstances are necessary for an order directing the cancellation of the bail, already granted. (Generally speaking, the grounds for cancellation of the bail, already granted, broadly (illustrative and not exhaustive) are: interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice or evasion of attempt to evade the due course of justice or abuse of the concession granted to the accused in any manner. The satisfaction of the court, on the basis of material placed on the record of the possibility of the accused absconding is yet another reason justifying the cancellation of bail. However, bail once granted should not be cancelled in a mechanical manner without considering whether any supervening circumstances have rendered it no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom by enjoying the concession of bail during the trial.”

10. These principles have been reiterated by another two Judge Bench decision in **Central Bureau of Investigation, Hyderabad v Subramani Gopalakrishnan (2011) 5 SCC 296** and more recently in **Dataram Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh (2018) 3 SCC 22:-**

"It is also relevant to note that there is difference between yardsticks for cancellation of bail and appeal against the order granting bail. Very cogent and overwhelming circumstances are necessary for an order directing the cancellation of bail already granted. Generally speaking, the grounds for cancellation of bail are, interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice or evasion or attempt to evade the due course of justice or abuse of the concessions granted to the accused in any manner. These are all only few illustrative materials. The satisfaction of the Court on the basis of



the materials placed on record of the possibility of the accused absconding is another reason justifying the cancellation of bail. In other words, bail once granted should not be cancelled in a mechanical manner without considering whether any supervening circumstances have rendered it no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom by enjoying the concession of bail during the trial."

11. In **"Myakala Dharmarajam Vs. The State of Telangana, (2020) 2 SCC 743"**, it has been held by the Supreme Court: -

*"In **Raghubir Singh v. State of Bihar, (1986) 4 SCC 481** this Court held that bail can be cancelled where (i) the accused misuses his liberty by indulging in similar criminal activity, (ii) interferes with the course of investigation, (iii) attempts to tamper with evidence or witnesses, (iv) threatens witnesses or indulges in similar activities which would hamper smooth investigation, (v) there is likelihood of his fleeing to another country, (vi) attempts to make himself scarce by going underground or becoming unavailable to the investigating agency, (vii) attempts to place himself beyond the reach of his surety, etc. The above grounds are illustrative and not exhaustive. It must also be remembered that rejection of bail stands on one footing but cancellation of bail is a harsh order because it interferes with the liberty of the individual and hence it must not be lightly resorted to.*

It is trite law that cancellation of bail can be done in cases where the order granting bail suffers from serious infirmities resulting in miscarriage of justice. If the court granting bail ignores relevant material indicating prima facie involvement of the Accused or takes into account irrelevant material, which has no relevance to the question of grant of bail to the accused, the High Court or the Sessions Court would be justified in cancelling the bail."



12. Furthermore, the Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No.658 of 2022 (arising out of SLP (Crl) NO.27 of 2022) titled as Imran Vs. Mr. Mohammed Bhava and another decided on 22.04.2022***, has held as under:

“26. Thus, while considering cancellation of bail already granted by a lower court, would indeed require significant scrutiny at the instance of superior court, however, bail when granted can always be revoked if the relevant material on record, gravity of the offence or its societal impact have not been considered by the lower court. In such instances, where bail is granted in a mechanical manner, the order granting bail is liable to be set aside. Moreover, the decisions cited herein above, enumerate certain basic principles which must be borne in mind when deciding upon an application for grant of bail. Thus, while each case has its own unique factual matrix, which assumes a significant role in determination of bail matters, grant of bail must also be exercised by having regard to the above-mentioned well-settled principles”.

13. It is, thus, clear that an appellate or a Superior Court can set aside the order granting bail, if the Court granting bail did not consider the relevant factors. Said position of law has been made further clear by Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No.680 of 2021*** arising out of ***SLP (Crl) No.3155 of 2018*** titled as ***M/s Supreme Bhiwandi Wada Manor Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and another*** decided on 26.07.2021.

14. Keeping in mind, the legal position as above, there is neither any allegation nor any circumstance in order to show that after grant of anticipatory bail by way of impugned orders, respondent No.2 misused the same in any manner whatsoever. There is nothing on record to suggest that respondent No.3 interfered in the course of investigation or attempted to tamper with the evidence or witnesses or threatened the witnesses or indulged in any such activity or that there was likelihood of his fleeing away from the country or not attending the trial.



Also, nothing on record has been brought to show that the respondent No.2 has left the country and rather appears to be a bald statement with no supporting cogent evidence.

15. There is no dispute that cogent and overwhelming circumstances or grounds are required to cancel the anticipatory bail already granted and ordinarily unless a strong case based on any supervening event is made out the Court should not interfere with Section 439 (2) Cr.P.C. For cancellation of bail, this Court has to bear in mind that:-

- "a) the accused misuses his liberty by indulging in similar criminal activity,*
- b) interferes with the course of investigation,*
- c) attempts to tamper with evidence or witnesses*
- d) threatens witnesses or indulges in similar activities which would hamper smooth investigation,*
- e) there is likelihood of his fleeing to another country,*
- f) attempts to make himself scarce by going underground or becoming unavailable to the Investigating Agency and*
- g) attempts to place himself beyond the reach of his surety."*

16. In State through **"CBI versus Amarmani Tripathi, AIR 2005 SC 3490"**, the Apex Court observed that for cancellation of bail supervening circumstances alone are relevant.

17. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. The allegations regarding the disputed transactions can be verified through documentary and electronic evidence, including bank records, UPI transaction details, and technical investigation. The petitioner has already joined the investigation, and no material has been brought on record to demonstrate that her



custodial interrogation is necessary for a fair and effective investigation. Accordingly, no ground is made out for interference with the order granting anticipatory bail.

18. In all the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court finds no ground to interfere in the impugned order dated 30.04.2026 (Annexure P-3) passed by the trial Court, so as to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2.

19. Hence, the present petition stands dismissed.

11.06.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No