

2026:PHHC:009262



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-64329-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision: 22.01.2026

MANJINDER SINGH @ BINDU BABA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. On 27.11.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.67 dated 16.04.2025, registered under Sections 61(2), 351(2), 351(3), 318(4), 316(2), 249, 336(3), 338, 340(2) of BNS, 4, 5, 6 of PCMC Act, 3(2) of HPIDFE Act, 2013 and 21(2) of BUDS Act, 2019, at Police Station Sadar Ratia, District Fatehabad.

Status report dated 27.11.2025, filed by respondent-State is taken on record.

The present case was registered on the application moved by complainant Amrik Singh, for taking action against Dr. Sukhdev Singh, for committing fraud by Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Services Private Company Limited and to grab an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- and for giving threat in case of demanding the abovesaid amount. Dr. Sukhdev Singh, has opened a company under the name and style of Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Services Private Limited in village Sehnal and now, he has shifted the said company in the house of petitioner-Baljinder Singh @ Bindu and there are 25 agents in the said company. The petitioner himself is one of the victim, who invested in the company of Dr. Sukhdev Singh but the said amount has not been returned to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that it is the main accused Dr. Sukhdev Singh, who was running his company by the name of Shishpal Frontlane Consultancy and Services Private Limited and had collected money from general public with a promise to double the amount. Initially, he was running the company in the house of one Sukhdev Singh son of Labh Singh and thereafter, he started running the company in the house of the present petitioner as a tenant. Learned counsel contended that petitioner has no concern with the business of the main accused or his company. In fact, he himself is the victim and he had also invested huge amount of money in the said company and he is being falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner has ready to join the investigation and abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has been nominated as an accused by the main accused namely Dr. Sukhdev Singh as his accomplice. Custodian investigation is required and does deserve concession of bail.

The main accused namely Dr. Sukdev Singh, was running his business in the premises owned by petitioner, which was taken on rent by the main accused. There is no allegation in the FIR against the present petitioner that he induced anyone to invest any amount in the company of the main accused. The petitioner has been named in the disclosure statement of the main accused as his accomplice. However, as to how much evidentiary value will be attached to the disclosure statement shall be subject matter of trial and the same infact is not admissible.

Adjourned to 22.01.2026.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii) that the petitioner 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) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior 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.”

2. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Krishan Kumar affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 27.11.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

5. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

22.01.2026

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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