



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:068964



210

CRM-M-18759-2026 (O&M)  
Date of decision:04.05.2026

Amrik Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Vikas Malik, Advocate,  
Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary, Advocate,  
Mr. Deepak Malik, Advocate and  
Mr. Balraj Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sumit S. Bairagi, Advocate for the complainant.

...

**Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.332, dated 09.09.2025, registered under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

2. Vide order dated 07.04.2026, passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted interim bail and was directed to join investigation.

3. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, who has filed his power of attorney, has



submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation on 16.04.2026 but he is not cooperating with the investigation. For the purpose of recovery of money which was received by him by sale of the property in question, not only once but twice, his custodial interrogation is required.

4. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

5. Though, it is submitted by learned State counsel that for effecting recovery of money, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. However, in the considered opinion of this Court, mere non recovery cannot by itself be a ground for denial of bail as has also been observed by the Delhi High Court in case titled as '*Jagdish Thakkar vs. State of Delhi*', *1992 (3) CCR 2764*' and in case titled as '*Pooran Singh vs. State of Delhi*', *2022(1) RCR (Criminal) 503*. So far as the contention that the petitioner has not cooperated in the investigation is concerned, it may be stated that the behaviour attributed to the petitioner cannot be considered as an instance of non-cooperation, justifying denial for grant of pre-arrest bail since, an accused, while joining investigation, is not expected to make self-incriminating statement under the threat that the State may seek withdrawal of the interim protection granted to him. The purpose of joining investigation is to make oneself available to the Investigating Agency and to respond to lawful queries and not to divulge self-incriminating information.

6. In view of the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and given the nature of allegations, this Court is of the opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. As such, without commenting on merits of case, this petition is allowed and the order dated



07.04.2026 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of BNS.

7. Since the main petition has been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**04.05.2026**

*harjeet*

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

**(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE**