



CRM-M-66591-2025

-1-

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

106**CRM-M-66591-2025**

Decided on: 07.04.2026

Prabhjot Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

106a**CRM-M-72487-2025**

Sohan Lal

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate, for
the petitioner in CRM-M-66591-2025.

Mr. Jasinder S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-72487-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Asim Aggarwal, Advocate
for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. By this order, the two above-mentioned petitions are disposed of, both having arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Prayer in the present petitions is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.267 dated 05.11.2025, registered under Sections 306, 316(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of complaint moved by Hindustan Unilever Limited through its authorized representative Khem Raj. It was alleged that

Prabhjot Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-66591-2025), who worked as



CRM-M-66591-2025

-2-

Security Guard in the company and Sohan Lal (petitioner in CRM-M-72487-2025), who worked as Assistant Technician alongwith other co-accused robbed the complainant company of expensive supply of chemical which costed approximately Rs.37 lacs plus GST. It was alleged that the petitioners in connivance with other co-accused, used the same number plate on two different trucks to create a false impression. One truck, which was still loaded, was shown as unloaded, so that the cameras at the weighment bridge record both trucks as empty and leave the premises, thereby hiding the fact that one truck was still carrying goods. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Apprehending arrest, the petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala praying for grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide orders dated 18.11.2025 and 11.12.2025, respectively. Hence, the petitioners have approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing the present petitions. It is apposite to mention here that vide orders dated 27.11.2025/22.12.2025 passed by this Court, no coercive action was ordered to be taken against the petitioners.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case on the basis of assumptions and presumptions.

Learned counsel for petitioner Prabhjot Singh has submitted that the petitioner is only the Security Guard in the complainant company.



CRM-M-66591-2025

-3-

He has submitted that the allegations regarding changing of number plates of two trucks was never in the domain of the petitioner. He submits that even otherwise, the complainant company is fitted with the CCTV cameras and the same could be verified from the footage of the same. He further contends that from the bare reading of the FIR, no role whatsoever has been attributed to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for petitioner Sohan Lal has submitted that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Technician Trainee in the complainant company. He contends that the petitioner is only responsible for supervising the unloading of the material and maintaining records of the quantity received, and is not responsible for recording or verifying the entry and exit weights of the trucks. He further contends that misappropriation, if any, has occurred is at the stage of exiting of trucks, which would be probably in the domain of the persons who are present at the weighment bridge and the drivers of the truck.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have, thus, submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, no *prima facie* case is made out against the petitioners, and hence, they deserve to be granted anticipatory bail.

5. Status reports dated 05.12.2025 and 25.02.2026 have already been filed.

Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioners. He submits that after conducting inquiry, both the petitioners, namely, Prabhjot Singh and Sohan Lal were



CRM-M-66591-2025

-4-

found to be involved in the alleged offence. He submits that petitioner Prabhjot Singh was one of the key persons, who was physically present at the factory gate and weighbridge area on the crucial dates and he actively facilitated the illegal entry, movement and manipulation of the trucks involved in the theft. He has further submitted that role attributed to the petitioners, is grave, deliberate and indispensable in the execution of the criminal conspiracy, which resulted in a massive financial loss to the complainant company. He submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required as the robbed amount is yet to be recovered. He, thus, submits that the present petitions deserve to be dismissed.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has also vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. It is contended that the petitioners in connivance with the co-accused duped the complainant company with an amount about Rs.37 lacs plus GST. He, thus, prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. A perusal of the FIR reveals that there are specific and serious allegations of cheating and fraud against the petitioners. The petitioners alongwith the co-accused after hatching conspiracy, committed theft of one truck loaded with chemical Linear Alkyl Benzene Sulphonic Acid (LABSA) amounting to Rs.40 lacs approximately. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* indicates the involvement of the petitioners in connivance with co-accused in executing the alleged *modus operandi* of manipulating the movement of trucks by using identical number plates to conceal the illegal removal of goods. The role attributed to the petitioners cannot be said to be



CRM-M-66591-2025

-5-

insignificant at this stage, rather the same appears to be integral to the commission of the alleged offence. Moreover, the investigation is still at a crucial stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioners is stated to be necessary for recovery of the misappropriated amount and to unearth the complete conspiracy.

8. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

482“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person 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) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous 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.”*



9. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State represented by CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

“6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under [Section 438](#) if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disintering many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulted by a pre-arrest bail during the time he 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 task of disintering offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

10. Hon'ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab**, AIR 1980 SC 1632, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary circumstances.

11. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioners has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.
12. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners do not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in their favour. Resultantly, the petitions being devoid of any merit are hereby dismissed.
13. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No