

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

CNR No: PHHC010770352026

2026:PHHC:134967



CRM-M-25778-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 14.09.2026

Pronounced and Uploaded on: 18.09.2026

Sukhdev Singh Bhullar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-35906-2026 (O&M)

Dilbagh Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

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

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anmoldeep Singh, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. These cases are disposed of by this common order as they arise out of the same FIR.
2. Prayer made in the present petitions is for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.52 dated 21.03.2026, registered under Sections 108, 351(3), 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 306, 506, 34 IPC), Section 238 BNS (Section 201 IPC) added later on, at Police Station

Ranjit Avenue, District Police, Commissioner Amritsar.

3. Learned Senior counsel submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated, solely on account of the fact that they are father and Personal Assistant of the main accused, namely Laljit Singh Bhullar. The petitioner in CRM-M-25778-2026, is a senior citizen, suffering from ailments and had merely applied for the tender in his name, while petitioner in CRM-M-35906-2026 is the PA to the main-accused. The deceased had addressed two complaints, dated 14.03.2026 and 16.03.2026, to the District Magistrate/Collector and instigation was over by the date of occurrence. As per the MLR, only a minor scratch was received on the head of the deceased, though allegations were of having been beaten up by all the accused persons. The main co-accused has already been arrested, qua whom the challan stands filed. No recovery is to be effected from the present petitioners, who are ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel as also the learned Senior counsel for the complainant, contended that during investigation, it has come forward that petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Bhullar is the main beneficiary, as he had applied for a tender, which were being handled by the deceased, who was posted as the District Manager in PSWC and was being pressurised for allotting the same to him by making an incriminating video of him having accepted Rs.10 lakh bribe, allegedly by the petitioner in CRM-M-35906-2026, on a mobile, which was circulated thereafter. It was found as per the CDR, that they, along with other accused, were present at the same spot, i.e. the house of the main accused, where beatings were given to the deceased by them, including a hit on

the back of his head with the butt of a pistol, however the same needs to be recovered and the video was made. The statement of one-Harpreet Singh Gill, Manager, PSWC, Chheharta-1, was recorded during investigation, wherein it has been stated that on 13.03.2026, the deceased disclosed to him that he was extended threats and beaten up by the accused person, including the petitioners and given one week's time for getting the tender allotted to petitioner- Sukhdev Singh Bhullar in CRM-M-25778-2026. The custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary to recover the mobile phone of the main accused, on which the video of the deceased was made; the hard disk of the N.V.R. of the CCTV cameras installed in the house of the main accused on 13.03.2026, when the afore acts took place; licence along with the two pistols owned by the petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, as also the names and details of the 3 persons, who were present at the spot on that day. They have expressed apprehensions that the petitioners may also influence the witnesses or tamper with evidence. Hence, pray for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard

6. To appreciate the controversy in proper perspective, it would be apposite to refer to the relevant part of the above-mentioned FIR, which is reproduced herein below:

“”To, the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar. Statement of Opinder Kaur (aged about 45 years) wife of Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, resident of House No.80, Sector 4, Ranjit Avenue, District Amritsar. Stated that I am resident of the above said address and I am appointed as a Science Teacher at Government Senior Secondary School, Hayer, Ajnala Road, Amritsar. I was married in the year 2007 to Gagandeep Singh Randhawa son of S. Channan Singh. We have three children, two girls and one boy. My husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa was posted as District Manager

in Punjab State Warehouse Corporation. My husband had the charge of Amritsar and Tarn Taran Districts. Punjab State Warehouse Corporation invited tenders for construction of new warehouses in various districts in October 2025 last year and the approval for these tenders was to be obtained from Chandigarh. In this regard, the Food Corporation of India (FCI) had to pass these tenders as per its prescribed rules. **In the areas of Patti and Bhikhiwind, which fall in District Tarn Taran, the present Transport Minister of the Punjab Government, Laljit Singh Bhullar, who is the present MLA from the Patti assembly constituency submitted tender for the construction of warehouses at these above places in the name of his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar and my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa was being continuously pressured by the Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar that the said tenders should be sanctioned in the name of his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar at any cost.** My husband told me about this many times in the past. In this regard, Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, Transport Minister's PA Dilbagh Singh alias Baga were continuously threatening my husband that if the said tender is approved in the name of Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bullar's father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, then he and his children will have to face severe consequences. Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar while threatening my husband also said many times that he also knows where Gagandeep Singh Randhawa's children study and where his wife works. My husband used to come home crying due to the constant pressure and tell me all these things and said that he cannot go beyond the rules and help any applicant because the entire process of tenders is completely transparent and online, due to which, under the legal rules, the said tender was issued to another party instead of the above party i.e. Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, father of Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, When Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar's father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar did not get the tender for the said warehouses, so the above said Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar became very angry and started harassing and humiliating my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa in a very bad way. Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar started threatening my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa by making WhatsApp calls that he should cancel the said tender and issue it in the name of his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, otherwise he will get my husband, his children and his entire family killed, as my husband does not even know that all the gangsters are his own and just one gesture from him is enough to kill my husband and his family. My husband

always tried to make the Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar explain repeatedly that it is not within his jurisdiction to cancel the tender and issue it in the name of his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar. **My husband told me the whole incident himself.** My husband also told me that Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar was threatening his and repeatedly saying that if he does not cancel the said tender on his asking and issues it in the name of his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, then either he and his family will be killed or he himself will end his life by consuming poison. Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar also threatened my husband that he cannot live by disobeying his orders. On 13.03.2026, the said Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar called my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa to his ancestral residence Patti, where apart from Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar's PA Dilbagh Singh alias Baga and two or three other unknown persons were present. As soon as my husband entered the house of Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar's father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar and Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar's PA Dilbagh Singh alias Baga slapped my husband Gagandeep Singh on the face and started beating my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa alongwith other unknown persons. Sukhdev Singh Bhullar who is the father of Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, taunted his son Laljit Singh Bhullar and said that what kind of minister are you that even a lower rank officer cannot issue a tender in your father's name on your orders. On hearing this, Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar took out the pistol kept in his dub and hit its butt on the head of my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, which hit behind my husband's left ear. The above accused Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar by pointing his pistol on my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa's temple said that you do not listen to us, now see what fate we will do to you. Thereafter, Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar instructed his P.A., Dilbagh Singh alias Baga to record video in which Gagandeep Singh Randhawa would repeat his words exactly. He added that if Randhawa failed to speak word for word as instructed in the video, he should be shot and his body disposed of. All the above accused threatened to kill my husband Gagandeep Singh and forced him to make a video by making false statements, in which he forced my husband to record a false statement at the pistol point that my husband Gagandeep Singh got allotted the above tender to some other party instead of Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, father of Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar after receiving

Rs.10 lakh. After forcibly recording the video, the above accused Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar threatened my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa and said that you did not listen to us, now see what fate we will do to you and they will not leave my husband and his family alive, either they will kill him or he will die by consuming poison. My husband Gagandeep Singh came home that same evening and told me all these things himself and said while crying that he is no longer alive. I told my husband that we should inform the police about this whole incident, but my husband said that Laljit Singh Bhullar is the Transport Minister in the present Punjab government and no one will listen to our complaint. My husband told all these things to some other members of my family apart from me. My husband who was very much forced due to the threats of humiliation and death extended by the above accused and he did not understand what to do now. My husband was being continuously threatened by above accused Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, his P.A. Dilbagh Singh alias Baga, due to which, he was under pressure and today on 21.03.2026 at around 5:50 AM, he consumed Salphos tablets and ended his life by making a video and posted the said video on social media before aying. Due to repeated insults, beatings, death threats extended by the said accused Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, his PA Dilbagh Singh alias Baga and 2-3 other unknown persons and due to Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar saying that either they have to kill my husband and his family, or he himself have to die by consuming poison, due to which, my husband Gagandeep Singh Randhawa has ended his life. Therefore, on the basis of above said facts, appropriate legal proceeding may kindly be initiated by lodging an FIR against the said accused Transport Minister Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, his PA Dilbagh Singh alias Baga and 2-3 other unidentified persons. Sd/-Opinder Kaur dated 21.03.2026.”

7. To ascertain the role of petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, as has emerged during investigation is concerned, a likewise reference would be aptly made to the reply dated 21.07.2026, filed by Assistant Commissioner of Police, North, Amritsar in CRM-M-25778-2026, which read thus:

“20. That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation of the present case, the residential house of the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar was visited on

28.3.2026 by the investigating officer and one N.V.R. of the CCTV cameras installed in his house was taken into police possession but the 'hard disk' of the NVR was not found available in the NVR.

xxx

xxx

xxx

34. Role of the petitioner: That the deponent humbly submits that during investigation, the role of the present petitioner Sukhdev Singh Bhullar has emerged to be active, direct and inseparable from the commission of the offences. The petitioner was not merely a prospective bidder in the tender process but was the principal beneficiary for whose benefit persistent pressure was exerted upon the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, District Manager, Punjab State Warehousing Corporation, to manipulate the tender process in violation of the prescribed rules. The complainant has specifically alleged that on 13.03.2026, when the deceased was called to the residence of co-accused Laljit Singh Bhullar at Patti, the present petitioner was present along with the other accused persons, where he actively participated in humiliating, assaulting and intimidating the deceased. The petitioner not only slapped and physically assaulted the deceased but also taunted his son, co-accused Laljit Singh Bhullar, for his failure to get the tender allotted in the petitioner's favour, thereby provoking further intimidation of the deceased. The deceased was thereafter compelled at gunpoint to record a false video confessing acceptance of illegal gratification and was repeatedly threatened with dire consequences in case the tender was not allotted in favour of the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner acted in concert with the co-accused in furtherance of their common intention and played a significant role in creating circumstances which ultimately drove the deceased to commit suicide.

35. Incriminating evidence against the petitioner: That the deponent humbly submits that the investigation has collected substantial incriminating material against the petitioner, which prima facie establishes his complicity in the commission of the offences. Besides the specific allegations contained in the FIR, the prosecution case is corroborated by the statement of independent witness Harpreet Singh Gill, Manager, Punjab State Warehousing Corporation, recorded under Section 180 BNSS, who has categorically stated that immediately after returning from the meeting held at the residence of the accused persons on 13.03.2026, the deceased narrated the entire incident to him, including the assault, humiliation, threats, forcible recording of the false video and the active participation of the present petitioner therein. The witness further disclosed that the deceased had

sustained injuries for which he obtained medical treatment on the same day and the relevant OPD slip and medical bills were produced during investigation. The CCTV footage collected from EMC Hospital corroborates that the deceased had visited the hospital for treatment of the head injury sustained during the occurrence. The investigating agency has also taken into possession the deceased's mobile phone containing the suicide video, the 32-second coerced video supplied by the complainant, documentary evidence relating to the tender process, and other electronic and documentary evidence, which collectively establish a continuous chain of circumstances pointing towards the petitioner's active involvement. Scientific examination reports of the electronic devices are also awaited, which may further strengthen the prosecution case."

8. Similarly, the involvement of the petitioner in CRM-M-35906-2026, as also the location of the phones of the deceased, the present petitioners, main accused and witness-Harpreet Singh Gill was examined by the investigating agency, showing their presence at the house of the main accused at the relevant time, when the threats were extended, beatings given, video made and circulated, has been enumerated in the status report dated 21.07.2026, filed by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, North, Amritsar, which reads thus:

"10. That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation of the present case, the Complainant Oppinder Kaur handed over one pen drive consisting of one video of 32 second of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa which was made on 13.3.2026 at the house/office of the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar forcibly with respect to receiving bribe of Rs10 lakhs for allotment of tender to the firm Baba Naga and this video was sent to the Complainant Oppinder Kaur by Sh. Gautam Jain, MD PSWCon 21.03.2026 who had told the complainant Oppinder Kaur that this video was sent to him by the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar. The Complainant Oppinder Kaur also handed over colour photo copies of letter No. PSWC/Admin/7215/2016 dated 14.3.2026, PSWC/Admin 7215- A/2026 dated 14.3.2026 and PSWC/Admin/7220/2026 dated 16.32.2026 having signatures of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa in English and the Complainant. Oppinder Kaur

stated that she does not know about original copies thereof.
The same were taken into police possession in accordance with law. The admitted hand writing of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa was also obtained from his office Ware House, New Amritsar.

xxx

xxx

xxx

13. That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation of the present case, the statement of the witness namely Harpreet Singh Gill Manager PSWC, Chheharta-1, Amritsar was recorded under Section 180 BNSS on 27.3.2026 wherein he verified that on 13.3.2026, he along with the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had gone to the house of the accused Laljit Singh Bullar at Patti and on returning to Amritsar, the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had told him that the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar and his accomplices i.e. Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, present petitioner PA Dilbagh Singh, one press reporter and 2 other persons had beaten him, insulted him, extended him threats, caused him injury on his head backside his ear and made his video forcibly with respect to having received bribe in allotment of tender. It was also stated that the deceased had also made a WhatsApp call to one Tarun of their department in Chandigarh and told him that Laljit Singh Bhullar had given him one-week time for getting the tender allotted to his father Sukhdev Singh Bullar. It was also stated that he along with the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had gone to Parvati Devi Hospital where Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had got issued OPD slip of Rs.400/- and had taken treatment for his injury and he had paid & 34/- to medical store, whose slip was produced by the witness. It was also stated that Ravinder Singh Ricky, friend of Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had also met them at A-block, Ranjit Avenue and Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had told him the entire episode. He (Harpreet Singh) had left the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa at his house. Thereafter, on 17.3.2026, the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had again met him and told that he had met the senior officers and was finding a solution. Thereafter, Gagandeep Singh Randhawa was transferred to Chandigarh and on 20.3.2026 Gagandeep Singh Randhawa had told him the Laljit Singh Bhullar had given him one week-time but tender would not be cancelled. Hence was very tensed. On 21.3.2026, he came to know that Gagandeep Singh Randhawa committed suicide, who has committed suicide due to being perturbed from Laljit Singh Bhullar, his father Sukhdev Singh, (present petitioner) PA Dilbagh Singh etc.

xxx

xxx

xxx

21. That it is pertinent to submit here that at the time of

inspection of residential house of the accused Laljit Singh Bullar, the videography of his residence was made on E-Sakshay Application. At that time, it was found that the sofa set and curtains being shown in the video dated 13.03.2026 of the deceased Dr. Gagandeep Singh Randhawa allegedly made by the accused persons under threat matched with the sofa set and curtains available in one room of the residential house of the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar. The relevant memo was prepared in this respect at the same time by the investigating officer.

22. That the deponent humbly submits that as the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar did not hand over his mobile phone, pistol used in commission of crime and hard disk of the NVR of the CCTV cameras of his house was found missing; hence offence under Section 238 BNS added vide GD No. 30, dated 5.4.2026 in the present case.

xxx

xxx

xxx

25. That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation of the present case, the witness namely Ravinder Pal Singh Slo Jaspal Singh handed over one letter written in Punjabi Language bearing No. F:G.GU/Admin/7215/2026, dated 14.03.2026 of PSW addressed to Sh. Gautam Jain, MD, PSW having signature of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa the copy whereof was addressed to Sh. Rahul Sindhu, Deputy Commissioner, Tarn Taran and this witness also handed over his mobile phone Samsung which were taken into police possession and statement of this witness Ravinder Pal Singh was also recorded under Section 180 BNSS in this respect.

26. That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation of the present case, the posting record of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, the record relating to the tender in question floated by the PSWC, the record relating to the application filed for allotment of this tender by co-accused Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, the record relating to the arms licenses of the accused Laljit Singh Bullar, co-accused Dilbagh Singh were obtained from concerned offices and statements of the concerned officials were recorded. Additionally, the call details record and tower locations of mobile phone number 99884-33589 of the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, mobile phone number 99156-63363 of the eye witness Harpreet Singh, the mobile number 98740-00007 of accused Laljit Singh Bhullar, mobile phone number 82889-14555 of present petitioner Sukhdev Singh Bhullar, mobile phone number 85004-87000 of co-accused PA Dilbagh Singh were obtained from concerned service provider companies and statement of the concerned witness was recorded. On making analysis of

these CDRs, on 13.03.2026, the location of mobile phone of the deceased Dr. Gagandeep Singh Randhawa and accused persons was found at the residence of the accused Laljit Singh Bhullar.

xxx

xxx

xxx

34. Role of the petitioner (Dilbagh Singh): That the deponent humbly submits that during the course of investigation, the role of the present petitioner Dilbagh Singh has surfaced as an active participant in the criminal conspiracy hatched by co-accused Laljit Singh Bhullar and Sukhdev Singh Bullar for illegally pressurising the deceased Gagandeep Singh Randhawa, District Manager, Punjab State Warehousing Corporation, to procure allotment of the warehouse tender in favour of Sukhdev Singh Bhullar. The investigation has revealed that the petitioner, being the Personal Assistant of co-accused Laljit Singh Bhullar, continuously extended threats to the deceased on behalf of the principal accused and remained present during the occurrence dated 13.03.2026 at the ancestral residence of Laljit Singh Bullar at Patti. As specifically alleged in the FIR, the petitioner actively participated in assaulting and humiliating the deceased, assisted in compelling him at gunpoint to make a false video admitting receipt of illegal gratification and, acting on the directions of co-accused Laljit Singh Bullar, recorded the said fabricated video while extending threats that in case the deceased failed to comply with their illegal demands, he and his family would face dire consequences. Thus, the petitioner acted in furtherance of the common intention and conspiracy of the co-accused and played a direct and active role in creating the circumstances which ultimately drove the deceased to commit suicide.

35. Incriminating evidence against the petitioner: That the deponent humbly submits that the investigation has collected substantial oral, documentary and electronic evidence establishing the complicity of the present petitioner. The allegations made in the FIR stand corroborated by the independent statement of witness Harpreet Singh Gill, Manager, Punjab State Warehousing Corporation, recorded under Section 180 BNSS, who categorically stated that after returning from the meeting held on 13.03.2026, the deceased narrated the entire occurrence to him, specifically naming the present petitioner as one of the persons who had assaulted, threatened and humiliated him and who had forcibly recorded the false video regarding alleged acceptance of Rs. 10 lakhs as bribe. The said witness further corroborated that the deceased sustained injuries during the occurrence, obtained medical treatment on the same day and produced the relevant OPD slip and medical bills. The

investigation has further secured CCTV footage of EMC Hospital corroborating the treatment of the deceased for the head injury, seized the mobile phone containing the deceased's suicide video, taken into possession the 32-second coerced video supplied by the complainant, collected screenshots of WhatsApp conversations and location-sharing records, and recorded the statements of other material witnesses including Jasbir Singh, Vikramjit Singh, Arvinder Singh and Lovepreet Singh, all of whom support the prosecution version regarding the continuous intimidation, threats and illegal pressure exercised by the accused persons, including the present petitioner. The scientific examination reports of the electronic devices are still awaited and are likely to further strengthen the prosecution case."

9. In the status report filed by Assistant Commissioner of Police, North, Amritsar dated 23.08.2026, it has been stated that the FSL report of the mobile of the deceased was received during pendency of the present petitions, relevant of which reads thus:

"5. That it is respectfully submitted that in view of the aforementioned report received from CFSL, Chandigarh, it has transpired that the deceased Gagandeep Singh had made the video in his own mobile phone which was uploaded before his death in the WhatsApp group 'International Friends' from his own mobile number on 21.03.2026 at 05:52:39 which was further forwarded from his mobile number +91-9653397013 of the witness Ravinderpal Singh and no addition/deletion etc. has been found in this video. As the mobile phone of the deceased Gagandeep Singh is enabled with Stolen Device Protection'; hence the WhatsApp Call History from this mobile phone could not be retrieved, which is pending to be retrieved after taking further action in this respect shall be taken accordingly."

10. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Jai Parkash Singh vs. State of Bihar** (2012) 4 SCC 379, while relying on the judgments in the cases of **D.K. Ganesh Babu vs. P.T Manokaran** (2007) 4 SCC 434, **State of Maharashtra vs. Mohd. Sajid Husain Mohd. S. Husain**, (2008) 1 SCC 213, and **Union of**

India vs. Padam Narain Aggarwal (2008) 13 SCC 305, held thus:

“6. We have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the record.

7. The provisions of Section 438 Cr.P.C. lay down guidelines for considering the anticipatory bail application, which read as under:

“438. Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest.-

(1) Where 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 that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail; and that court may, after taking into consideration, inter alia, the following factors, namely:-

(i) The nature and gravity of the accusation;

(ii) The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether he has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a court in respect of any cognizable offence;

(iii) the possibility of the applicant to flee from justice; and

(iv) where the accusation has been made with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by having him so arrested, either reject the application forthwith or issue an interim order for the grant of anticipatory bail.”

XX

XX

XX

8. In view of the above, it is mandatory on the part of the court to ensure the compliance of the pre-requisite conditions for grant of anticipatory bail including the nature and gravity of the accusation.

XX

XX

XX

13. There is no substantial difference between Sections 438 and 439 Cr.P.C. so far as appreciation of the case as to whether or not a bail is to be granted, is concerned. However, neither anticipatory bail nor regular bail can be granted as a matter of rule. The anticipatory bail being an extraordinary privilege should be granted only in exceptional cases. The judicial discretion conferred upon the court has to be properly exercised after proper application of mind to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

XX XX XX

21. In the facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the considered opinion that it was not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. The High Court ought to have exercised its extraordinary jurisdiction following the parameters laid down by this Court in above referred to judicial pronouncements, considering the nature and gravity of the

offence and as the FIR had been lodged spontaneously, its veracity is reliable. The High Court has very lightly brushed aside the fact that FIR had been lodged spontaneously and further did not record any reason as how the pre-requisite conditions incorporated in the statutory provision itself stood fulfilled. Nor did the court consider as to whether custodial interrogation was required.”

11. In the case of **P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement**, (2019) 9 SCC 24, Hon’ble the Supreme Court has observed that, “Ordinarily, arrest is a part of procedure of the investigation to secure not only the presence of the accused but several other purposes. Power under Section 438 CrPC is an extraordinary power and the same has to be exercised sparingly. The privilege of the pre-arrest bail should be granted only in exceptional cases. The judicial discretion conferred upon the court has to be properly exercised after application of mind as to the nature and gravity of the accusation; possibility of applicant fleeing justice and other factors to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Grant of anticipatory bail to some extent interferes in the sphere of investigation of an offence and hence, the court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail. Anticipatory bail is not to be granted as a matter of rule and it has to be granted only when the court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extraordinary remedy.”

12. Pertinently the petitioner in CRM-M-25778-2026 had participated in the tender process, which was allotted to the firm M/s Baba Naga Agro Private Limited, but the deceased was being compelled to cancel the same and allot to the above petitioner, father of the Transport Minister, Punjab, who is in custody in the present FIR. On 13.03.2026, allegedly a video was prepared at

the house of the said Minister, a fact affirmed during the course of investigation, as the the sofa set and curtains seen therein matched with the ones available in one room of the residential house of the main accused, as also the presence of the present petitioners, deceased along with the said Minister and witness-Harpreet Singh Gill, who had accompanied the deceased at that time stood confirmed, whereby in order to pressurize and humiliate him, he was forced to confess to having accepted bribe for allotting the tender to the above firm, which was even received by the complainant later on and he was subjected to a blow by a butt of pistol on the back of his head, near the ear and slaps by, both the petitioners as also the other accused person. It has also been stated by the above witness that the deceased had on the way back to Amritsar disclosed that threats were extended to him and granted a week's time, for getting the tender re-allotted in the name of Sukhdev Singh Bhullar (petitioner). Immediately on expiry of the said period, he committed suicide on 21.03.2026.

13. Considering the gravity of the allegations, permitting the petitioners to join the investigation with a protective umbrella of pre-arrest bail will impede the thorough and effective investigation to elicit the truth; moreover the recovery of the DVR, which was allegedly removed, as also of the pistol and mobile phones are yet to be effected; there being an apprehension expressed of them influencing the witnesses and tampering with the evidence, their custodial interrogation is stated to be imperative, thus this Court does not find it to be a case for granting anticipatory bail.

14. In view of the above, there being no merit in the petitions, the same are hereby dismissed.

15. The observations made hereinabove are meant only for the purpose of deciding the present petitions and in no manner are to be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

18.09.2026

M.Kamra

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