

2026:PHHC:087174



104

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

**CRM-M-33051-2026(O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026**

PANKAJ DHAWAN**.....PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**...RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Paras Jagga, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked Under 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Section 438 CrPC) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 58 dated 04.04.2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 351(2), 190 and 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 323, 506, 149 and 380 IPC) at Police Station Shimlapuri, Ludhiana. District Police Commissionerate

2. Contention**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the instant FIR has been registered on the allegations that the petitioner demanded return of money from the complainant, went to his house and along with some unknown persons, allegedly assaulted the complainant and his family members, snatched a mobile phone and

threatened them. However, the FIR itself shows that the dispute between the parties arose out of a monetary transaction and the petitioner had gone to the complainant regarding repayment of money due to him. It is his contention that the petitioner had advanced substantial amounts to the complainant, who failed to return the same despite repeated demands. The petitioner is in possession of cheques issued by the complainant and the corresponding cheque dishonour memos. Prior to registration of the FIR, the petitioner had also submitted a representation to the police authorities stating that the complainant and his father were threatening to implicate him in false criminal cases if he continued demanding repayment of his money.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/Complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State.

He opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner in the FIR. It is contended that the petitioner, along with other persons, trespassed into the house of the complainant, assaulted the complainant and his family members, snatched a mobile phone and extended threats. He, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, a perusal of the FIR shows that the dispute between the parties admittedly stems from a monetary transaction. The allegations levelled in the FIR are matters of investigation and trial. At this stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear necessary, particularly when the case primarily arises out of a pre-existing monetary dispute and no recovery is stated to be effected from him.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona*

fide intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person 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) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

10.06.2026
anuradha

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No