



2026:PHHC:087889

2026:PHHC:087889



101

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

CRM-M No.33467 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-22.06.2026

Beant Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Sukhmeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short the "BNSS") is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.130 dated 18.03.2026 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC [Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3) and 340(2) of the BNS, 2023] registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he appeared as a surety in 10 different cases, the details of which are given in the reply and furnished his surety bonds along with an affidavit stating that he had never stood surety earlier on the basis of the property submitted whereas, in each case, the same land was shown to be under the ownership of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that the authorities could have checked



CRM-M No.33467 of 2026 (O&M) -2-

online as regards the surety bonds having been furnished by the petitioner in other cases. He further submits that the petitioner is willing to join investigation and abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for the grant of anticipatory bail stating that custodial interrogation would be imperative to elicit the truth.

5. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that there is no ground to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. He appeared as a surety in 10 different cases and furnished surety bonds qua the same land along with false affidavits stating that he had never stood surety on the basis of the said property. Such like persons who have committed fraud not only with the public but also with the Court do not deserve to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. That being so, the petition is found to be devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

June 22, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No