



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M No.57466 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :21.01.2026

Amandeep Singh @ Kalu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Deepak Arya, Advocate for
Mr.Rajat Dogra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in a case arising out of FIR No.204 dated 11.12.2023 under Sections 454 and 380 IPC, Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar.

2. Vide order dated 14.10.2025, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer.

3. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with the above mentioned order, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and that the order dated 14.10.2025, whereby the petitioner was afforded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, be made



absolute.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Police West Amritsar. The same be taken on record.

5. It has been contended by learned State counsel that although the petitioner has joined investigation but he has been non-co-operative during the course of investigation and that for the recovery of stolen property his custodial interrogation is required. In addition to above, the learned State counsel has also contended that the petitioner is not having clean antecedents.

6. Heard. The record has been perused carefully.

7. A perusal of the record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for the purpose of decision in present petition:-

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the allegations with regard to theft are not against the petitioner and the only allegations against the petitioner are that he had purchased the stolen property from the accused, who had allegedly committed the theft;
- iii) that the recovery can be facilitated by giving a direction to the petitioner to join investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer;
- iv) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;



- v) that trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence, or influence the witnesses;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if petitioner is released on bail, he will not participate/co-operate in the trial.

8. In view of above, it is hereby held that the present petition deserves to be allowed and the order dated 14.10.2025, whereby the benefit of interim bail was accorded to the petitioner, deserves to be made absolute.

9. Hence the present petition stands allowed and the order dated 14.10.2025 is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

21.01.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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