



CRM-M-65189 of 2025

-1-

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

344

CRM-M-65189 of 2025

Date of Decision: 28.01.2026

Rajinder Kashyap

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aiman J. Chishti, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.18 dated 17.09.2025 registered under Sections 319, 140, 3(5) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Cyber Crime Police Station, Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that Head Constable Balwinder Singh along with his associates had illegally abducted three persons from Noida, impersonated themselves as Senior Police officers and thereafter kept the victims confined at different places for the purpose of extortion running into crores of rupees, including extortion of cryptocurrency and mobile phones. Hence, the present FIR.

**CRM-M-65189 of 2025****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any concern with the alleged crime. It has also been contended that during investigation, co-accused Khushdev Singh @ Mani was arrested and the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the said co-accused. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation has no evidentiary value. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, vide order dated 06.11.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, she has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused Khushdev Singh @ Mani. She further argued that petitioner was

**CRM-M-65189 of 2025****-3-**

the unidentified associate who was present at the scene of occurrence in khakhi uniform, thereby indicating his direct participation in the commission of the alleged crime. She further argued that the petitioner took the vehicle in question from co-accused Khushdev Singh @ Mani at Giaspura, Ludhiana, which itself prove his active involvement and direct role in the commission of the crime. She argued that despite repeated attempts, notice and efforts by the investigating agency, the petitioner has not joined the investigation. She further argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a fair and proper investigation in the matter as well as to unearth the modus operandi of accused and to recover the mobile phones, digital devices and other incriminating material to establish the financial trail including crypto-transaction. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He is specifically nominated as an accused in the disclosure statement made by co-accused Khushdev Singh @ Mani, thus, his custodial interrogation is required to uncover the modus operandi and to recover the mobile phones, digital devices and other incriminating material. The events in entirety indicate towards the existence of a bigger syndicate indulging in criminal activities. The Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be



CRM-M-65189 of 2025

-4-

justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of



disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".

Economic Offences

*78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*

XXX XXX XXX

83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials



CRM-M-65189 of 2025

-6-

which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

28.01.2026*D.Bansal*

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