

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:090079



104

CRM-M-35079-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision:03.07.2026

Gurdarshan Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.222, dated 18.09.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 356(2) and 61(2) of the BNS, at Police Station Division No.8, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint jointly submitted by Bhupinder Singh and Rajinder Singh, partners of M/s Dream Film Production Company, alleging therein that on 07.11.2024, they received a phone call from Netherlands Embassy, making inquiry about the fact that whether a female named as Sandeep Kumari, who was an artist, is working in their company or not? The complainants replied in the negative and were informed that by using their email ID, the abovesaid Sandeep Kumari had applied for visa. An NOC was purported to

have been issued on the letter head of the production company of the complainants. The signatures of the complainants as well as seal of the company had been forged on this letter head and NOC was given to Sandeep Kumari for celebrating holidays in Netherlands and France from 16.11.2024 to 25.11.2024. By alleging that someone had prepared forged documents in the name of their company to cause loss to them and defraud them, they prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated and are underway. It was revealed that the above named Sandeep Kumari had applied for visa through the present petitioner, who had prepared the documents and had forwarded the same to another agent, namely, Daman at Delhi for the purpose of issuance of visa. The petitioner was nominated as accused. Apprehending his arrest, he filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 22.06.2026.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of Sandeep Kumari to the effect that she had applied for visa through the present petitioner. He was not named in the FIR. He is alleged to have forwarded the documents of Sandeep Kumari to Daman, who is working as a travel agent at Connaught Place, Delhi. He is not the beneficiary of any of the alleged act nor was responsible for creating the forged NOC letter. It was the travel agent Daman, who had prepared the fake NOC on the letter head of the complainants' company and had submitted the same to the Netherlands Embassy. His custodial interrogation is not required. The case is

based on documentary and electronic evidence and as such, no recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. He has also cooperated with the inquiry proceedings and appeared before the concerned Inquiry Officer and has not evaded the process of law. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, learned Senior DAG, Punjab has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is argued by her that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature as he either himself or in connivance with the co-accused had prepared forged and fabricated documents by using the name of the complainant's company, their seal as well as by forging their signatures on a letter of NOC and by making false declaration in the said letter. For the purpose of conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is must. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

8. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have cheated the complainants' company by preparing forged and fabricated documents by using its name, their seal as well as by forging their signatures on a letter of NOC. In view of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, *prima facie* his complicity in commission of subject offences stands established. For the purpose of conducting deeper probe and thorough investigation, his custodial interrogation is required. It is well settled

proposition of law that powers for grant of anticipatory bail should be exercised in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and not in routine manner. No such circumstance, however, has been made out in this case. If the petitioner is given the shield of anticipatory bail that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The Court is also required to see that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

03.07.2026

harjeet

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No