

2026:PHHC:087169



110

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33375-2026(O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

GURPARKASH VIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. S.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(through Hybrid Mode)
Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) (Section 438 of Cr.P.C) for the grant of Anticipatory Bail in a case FIR No.148, dated 20.05.2026 under Sections 303(2), 316(2), 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 316(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, (Section 379, 406, 420, 465, 468, 467, 471, and 409 of IPC) registered at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur (Annexure P-1), in the interest of justice.

2. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He has argued that there is no link

evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the present case. He has further argued that the petitioner has already deposited the alleged amount and present FIR has been registered after depositing entire amount by the petitioner with the complainant. He has also argued that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, who is ready to join investigation.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

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

He opposes the petition for bail stating that the petitioner has embezzled total amount of Rs. 37,85,000/- of various funds and has got the said amount released by forging signatures of concerned DDOs from time to time. He has also argued that the applicant/accused has repaid the said amount but being public servant, he has committed theft, criminal breach. He, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

3. **Analysis**

The allegations against the petitioner pertain to embezzlement of government funds and forgery of documents. However, it is not disputed that the entire alleged amount has since been deposited by the petitioner. The prosecution case is primarily based on official records and documentary evidence, which are already in possession of the investigating agency. No specific recovery is stated to be effected from the petitioner.

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.

10.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No