



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-33720-2025 (O&M)

Decided on: 23.04.2026

HARMANDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Himmat Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.CRM-12427-2026

1. Present application has been moved by the applicant/petitioner for placing on record copy of the amended petition, vide order dated 17.09.2025 passed by this Court.
2. Notice in the application.
3. On advance notice, Mr. Himmat Singh Sidhu, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant, and Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State, and raise no objection, if prayer made in the present application, is allowed.
4. Considering the averments mentioned in the present application, prayer made therein is allowed.



5. Registry is directed to tag the amended petition appended with the present application, at the appropriate place with the file.

6. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-33720-2025

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 First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Harmander Singh, aged about 61 years	93	27.05.2025	308(2), 316(2), 351(2) of BNS (corresponding to sections 384, 406 and 506 IPC) and Sections 65, 66 of I.T. Act [offence under sections 316(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2) of BNS (corresponding to sections 408, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC) added later on, vide GD No.35 dated 15.09.2025]	Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib	Sri Muktsar Sahib

2. On 02.07.2025, following order was passed:-

- “1. xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
2. *Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that petitioner had served the complainant-company i.e. Satia Industries Limited, from the year 1991 until April 2024. In this regard, reliance is placed upon a certificate dated 13.03.2024 issued by the complainant-company itself, wherein the petitioner’s commendable career and valuable contributions were acknowledged. The certificate reflects that the company was fully satisfied and indebted for the useful services rendered by the petitioner during his long tenure.*
3. *With respect to the allegations that petitioner, after his retirement, engaged in acts of blackmailing, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to a complaint dated 18.04.2025, which was*



addressed by the petitioner to the GST and Income Tax Departments via email. It is submitted that the said complaint is currently under inquiry/investigation, and even if the complainant-company claims the allegations to be frivolous, such a complaint cannot form the basis for initiating criminal proceedings against the petitioner under the alleged offences.

Learned counsel also argues that if any harassment, humiliation, or reputational damage was caused to the company on account of the said complaint, appropriate remedy available to the complainant-company was to seek damages under the relevant civil laws, rather than resorting to criminal prosecution.

4. *Further, it is submitted that any offence, if at all committed as alleged by the complainant-company, would fall within the purview of the Information Technology Act, and such offences are bailable in nature. Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, appeared on behalf of the respondent-State. Mr. Baltej Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate, with Mr. Divij Datt and Mr. Himmat Singh Sidhu, Advocates, put an appearance on behalf of the complainant.*

7. *Counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner, submitting that petitioner's conduct since his retirement has been humiliating. It is contended that petitioner is misusing the company's data, which has allegedly been stolen by him, and that after retirement, he has been blackmailing the company on various pretexts.*

8. *Adjourned to 17.09.2025.*

9. *In the 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 be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*



10. *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.

11. *Let the petitioner and representatives of the complainant – company be present before this Court, on the next date of hearing to find out solution to resolve the dispute amicably.”*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 02.07.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that although, the petitioner has joined investigation, but he has not fully cooperated, as he failed to provide his voice sample.

5. In response, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was never called upon to furnish his voice sample. However, it is fairly submitted that petitioner is ready to provide the same, if one opportunity is granted to him.

6. Opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, learned Senior Counsel for the complainant contends that petitioner has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail already granted by this Court.

It is submitted that in December 2025, a ransom amounting to Rs.300 crores was allegedly demanded by accused persons in connivance with the present petitioner, by issuing forged letters



purportedly emanating from the Enforcement Directorate, in connection with FIR No. 232 dated 30.12.2025.

7. In response to this, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that in relation to the allegations arising out of FIR No. 232 dated 30.12.2025, petitioner has already been granted regular bail by the competent Court.

8. This factual position has not been disputed by learned Senior Counsel for the complainant.

9. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

10. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation; ad-interim bail order dated 02.07.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. **Accordingly, present petition is allowed.**

However, 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.

11. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

12. It is made clear that present order shall be subject to furnishing of voice sample by the petitioner, within a period of two weeks from today, before the concerned Magistrate.

13. It is further directed that present order shall also be subject to depositing of passport by the petitioner with the Investigating Agency or the Court concerned, if he is in possession of the same, within a period of one week from today. In the alternative, petitioner shall file an affidavit stating that he does not possess any passport.



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

15. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

23.04.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO