



CRM-M-70470-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

138/2

CRM-M-70470-2025
Decided on: 25.03.2026

Narinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.389 dated 26.12.2023, under Sections 406, 420, 379-B, 120-B and 506 IPC at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

2. On 15.12.2025, following order was passed:

“(i) *** **

(ii) *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that complainant, Amit Verma, got the FIR registered by stating that he was working as a Sales Manager, along with one Sandeep Singh, at Unimoney Financial Services Limited (Foreign Exchange), situated at Sector 9D, Chandigarh. On 25.04.2023, one regular customer, Vikram Kapila, allegedly called the complainant to exchange 10,000 US Dollars of his friend into Indian currency and requested that the exchanged amount be delivered at Zirakpur. In the parking area of Motia Groups, Zirakpur, Vikram Kapila, along with Bhupinder Singh, C.V. Verma, Narinder Singh (petitioner herein), Vinay, Chetan, and Tarun Rawat, was present. It is alleged that C.V. Verma asked the complainant to come to his office for a discussion. Upon doing so, Vikram Kapila instructed the complainant to hand over Rs.8,00,000 to Vinay, assuring that the documentation would be completed later. Complainant, however, refused and asked them to first bring the*



dollars. It is further alleged that Vikram Kapila then snatched the bag containing Rs.8,00,000 and fled the spot. Subsequently, Vikram Kapila handed over a cheque of Rs.2,00,000, Bhupinder Singh gave a cheque of Rs.2,00,000, and another co-accused Chetan Bhardwaj handed over two cheques of Rs.2,00,000, each. However, all the cheques were dishonoured upon presentation.

(iii) . Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, insofar as the role attributed to the present petitioner is concerned, he was allegedly present in the parking area at Zirakpur where the incident is stated to have occurred. However, no specific or overt act has been attributed to the petitioner, and his implication is merely on the basis of his alleged presence as part of an assembly. Moreover, there is no substantial proof to establish that co-accused was actually in possession of 10,000 US Dollars, and in the absence of such proof, facts as alleged in the FIR cannot be said to be true. It is contended that the only appropriate remedy available to the complainant, if any, was to initiate proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, for dishonour of cheques.

(iv) Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that story set up by the complainant is highly doubtful, as the alleged incident of snatching Rs.8,00,000 purportedly took place on 26.04.2023, while the complaint was filed only on 01.05.2023 which was later converted into FIR on 26.12.2023, after the cheques had been dishonoured. Cheques in question include cheque No.00117 dated 05.05.2023 for Rs.2,00,000 drawn on IDFC Bank, cheque no. 070240 dated 02.05.2023 for Rs.2,00,000 drawn on Axis Bank, and cheques nos. 000085 and 000086 dated 05.05.2023 for Rs.2,00,000 each drawn on Kotak Mahindra Bank. It is further submitted that even otherwise also, no criminal offence is made out, as for nearly 1 year and 10 months, investigating officer has not deemed it necessary to arrest the petitioner or any of the co-accused.

(v) It is lastly submitted by counsel for the petitioner that co-accused Chetan Bhardwaj, has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 03.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-61483-2025. Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

(vi) Notice of motion.

(vii) On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.

(viii) Adjourned to 21.01.2026.

To be heard along with CRM-M-61483-2025.



(ix) *Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

(x) *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation, and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 15.12.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

5. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

7. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

25.03.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
~~YES~~/NO