

2026.PHHC.087184



116

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33539-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

BIPIN @ VIPAN @ VIPIN HARENDRA SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Chetan Sharma, Advocate
(through Hybrid Mode)
Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate
Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Advocate
Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate and
Ms. Akshit Nanda, 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 section 482 BNSS (Section 438 of Cr.P.C) seeking grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 73 dated 27.04.2026 registered under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC) at Police Station Barnala, District Barnala (P-1).

2. Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and had already ceased to be associated with the complainant's establishment in the year 2024, with his last salary having been

credited in August 2024. It is submitted that the allegations are based solely on stock audits, inventory records and internal documents, all of which are already in the possession of the complainant and investigating agency.

Learned counsel further argues that no specific role, overt act, forged document or wrongful gain has been attributed to the petitioner and the FIR contains vague allegations and no date is coming forth. It is contended that the matter is purely documentary in nature, no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and, therefore, custodial interrogation is not required. Accordingly, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail.

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 petition for bail stating that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are found to be grave and serious in nature. The petitioner, in connivance with his wife, committed misappropriation of Rs.42,46,641/- and in this manner, not only cheated the complainant but also the general public and also forged the false price tags of the articles displayed in the showroom.

3. **Analysis**

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court finds that the petitioner claims to have severed his association with the complainant's establishment in the year 2024 and the FIR does not specify any particular date or overt act attributable to him. No recovery is stated to be effected from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation does not appear necessary for the purpose of investigation.

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 petitioners, wherein he has *bona*

fide intentions and are 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 petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to their 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