



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-63035 of 2025

Date of Decision: 05.03.2026

Dalbir Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Bakshi, Advocate
for the complainant.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for pre-arrest bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.114 dated 24.05.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 406, 420 and 120-B of 'the Indian Penal Code, 1860' Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar, Punjab.

2. The learned State Counsel has filed reply. The same be taken on record.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that

custodial interrogation is not required.

5. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel, being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has contended that the petitioner has committed forgery of the document and for the recovery of documents and collection of relevant evidence the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. A perusal of the record shows that dispute in the present case is with regard to transfer of property beyond his share. In order to prove the above-mentioned allegations, coupled with the allegations of forgery, the evidence to be collected by the Investigating Agency is documentary in nature for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary. Otherwise also, if any inquiry is to be made from the petitioner the same can be facilitated by issuing a direction to the petitioner to join investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. It is also a settled principle of law that a suspect/accused cannot be forced to give evidence against himself.

7. In view of above-mentioned observation, the order dated 11.11.2025, whereby the benefit of interim anticipatory bail was accorded to the petitioner, is hereby made absolute. The present petition stands **allowed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

March 05, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No