

2026:PHHC:087356



126

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

**CRM-M-33796-2026  
DECIDED ON: 12.06.2026**

**SHAILENDRA SINGH BUNDELA**

**.....PETITIONER(S)**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**.....RESPONDENT(S)**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Kapish Singla, Advocate for the petitioner

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

**1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023/438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.26 dated 02.02.2026 registered at Police Station Section 53, Gurugram under Sections 316(2), 316(4), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of BNS (406, 420, 468, 467, 470 and 120-A of IPC).

**2 Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role whatsoever in the alleged transactions. It is contended that the petitioner was merely a service provider/vendor engaged by the complainant company for execution of the assigned work and had no involvement in the internal affairs of the company,

including processing, approval, or release of any payments. Learned counsel further submits that the role attributed to the petitioner is distinguishable from the main allegations and that the co-accused, namely Diksha Shukla @ Deeksha Shukla, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 10.06.2026 passed in CRM-M-33337-2026. The petitioner has also undertaken to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

Notice of motion.

**On behalf of the State/complainant**

On the asking of Court, Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for dismissal of the present petition on the ground that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused person has actively participated in the commissioning of offence.

3. **Analysis**

After considering the rival submissions and the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the prima facie view that the petitioner appears to be a service provider/vendor having no direct involvement in the internal processing, approval, or release of payments. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not found to be necessary for the purpose of investigation, particularly in view of his undertaking to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency. The fact that the co-accused has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail also weighs in favour of 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.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**12.06.2026**

*Meenu*

*Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No*

*Whether reportable :Yes/No*