



103

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

**CRM-M-38308-2025  
DECIDED ON: 19.05.2026**

**HARPREET SINGH****.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Vishal Tartyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishnu Dutt, Advocate, for  
Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate, for the complainant.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)**

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0051, dated 14.05.2025, under Section 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, District Gurdaspur.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant Harjit Kaur has got the present FIR registered against the petitioner and his co-accused, namely Manpreet Singh, on the basis of a concocted version and as a counterblast to FIR No.124 dated 07.12.2024, registered under Sections 109, 324(4), 61(2) of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, District Gurdaspur, wherein the complainant's son, namely Taranjit Singh alias Taranpreet Singh alias Tannu, is an accused and has already been granted bail, vide

order dated 23.06.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur.

3. It is further submitted that the amount of Rs.4.02 lakhs had, in fact, been deposited in the account of the petitioner on 31.01.2024, and only after the involvement of the complainant's son in the aforesaid criminal case, present FIR was lodged against the petitioner on 14.05.2025.

Thus, counsel for the petitioner submits that present FIR is *prima facie* lodged in retaliation, being a consequence of the criminal proceedings already pending against the complainant's son. It is contended that allegations incorporated in the FIR are yet to be substantiated, during investigation or upon filing of the *challan* before learned trial Court. It is further argued that dispute is essentially civil in nature, but has unnecessarily been given a criminal colour by lodging the present FIR.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as counsel appearing for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that petitioner and his co-accused have defrauded poor persons, and therefore, no concession of anticipatory bail deserves to be granted to them.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

6. At this stage, it is noticeable that FIR No.124 dated 07.12.2024, under Sections 109, 324(4), 61(2) of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, District

Gurdaspur, had already been registered against the complainant's son, whereas present FIR came to be lodged after a gap of nearly one year and five months, with respect to the amount allegedly deposited in the account of the accused in January, 2024. Whether the said amount was deposited for the purpose alleged in the FIR, or for some other reason cannot, at this stage, be conclusively determined.

7. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it necessary to keep the present petition pending any further and, accordingly, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, with the direction to the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

19.05.2026  
*Lavisha*

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable*              *Yes/No*