

**IN THE COURT OF HARINDER SIDHU
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, PATIALA
(UID NO. PB0130)**

**BA No.1214 of 30.03.2026
Registration No.2213 of 2026
CNR No. PBPT 01003972-2026
Date of Order: 01.04.2026**

Bikramdeep Singh (aged 39 years) 


...Petitioner/Accused

versus

State of Punjab through Investigating Officer/Station House Officer,
Police Station, Division No.4 (Lahori Gate), Patiala district Patiala.

... Respondent

FIR no. 56 dated 21.03.2026
Under Sections 331(4), 305 of the BNS, 2023
(corresponding to Sections 457, 380 of the IPC, 1860)
Police Station: Division No.4 (Lahori Gate), Patiala.

**First Bail Application under section 482 of the BNSS, 2023
(corresponding to section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of
anticipatory bail to the petitioner/applicant.**

Present: Sh. Anish Jain, Advocate and Sh. Amit Jain, Advocate, for
the petitioner-accused.

Sh. Charanjit Singh Bhullar, Additional Public Prosecutor for
the State assisted by

Sh. HPS Verma, Advocate, for the complainant.

ORDER:

The petitioner Bikramdeep Singh is before this court, in an
application filed under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha

Sanhita, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 56 dated 21.03.2026, registered at police station Division no.4(Lahori Gate), Patiala for commission of offences punishable under sections 331(4), 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Notice of the bail application was issued to the State. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State Sh. Charanjit Singh Bhullar along with the investigating officer of the case, appeared to represent the state and contest the bail application. Sh.HPS Verma, Advocate appeared and filed power of attorney on behalf of the complainant. The record of investigation has been produced.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief is that the petitioner, a serving judicial officer in conspiracy with the peon/maid having access to the house of Sh.Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District & Sessions Judge (*hereinafter referred to as the "deceased"*) and other associates, removed gold and jewellery from the residence of the deceased, on the night when he had expired in the hospital. It is alleged, that the CCTV footage of the premises belonging to the deceased shows the petitioner entering and exiting the premises alongwith the co-accused and some official gunmen. The act is alleged to have been without lawful authority and with a dishonest intention. The FIR has been registered on the complaint of Dr.Bhupinder Singh Virk, the power of attorney of Angadpal Singh son of late Kanwaljit Singh; the deceased. The contents of the FIR which are in vernacular when translated into english read as under:-

“Stated that I am a resident of the aforementioned address and I work as a professor in the ‘Department of Law’ at Punjabi University Patiala. My friend, late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge (Sangrur), and myself were classmates and we had a good friendship from the beginning. My friend, late Kanwaljit Singh, was posted as Additional District Judge (Sangrur) and he passed on 01-08-2025 at Amar Hospital, Patiala, and on 01-08-2025, when my friend's dead body was at Amar Hospital, Patiala, that night around 8:46 PM, Amarjot Kaur alias Pinky, working at my friend's house, and Gaurav Goel son of Satpal Goel, resident of power house road, Main Chowk, Bathinda, a government officer who was posted with my deceased friend Late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge (Sangrur), regarding whom I have concrete evidence, and an unknown person came in three cars to the house of my friend Late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge, Sangrur. My friend Late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge, Sangrur's House, no.74C, Vikas Colony, Patiala, had CCTV cameras installed. Out of these four people, Gaurav stayed outside, and the remaining three went inside the house and started rummaging through the house of my friend Late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge, Sangrur. At that time, these three people, after searching my friend's house, took away ancestral gold, jewellery, and cash from the house. I have the CCTV footage of this entire incident. When my friend, late Kanwaljeet Singh, Additional District Judge Sahib Sangrur, passed, his elder son Angadpal Singh, aged 25 years, who works abroad in Canada as an advocate, and his younger son Arjanpal Singh, aged about 17 years, who is

studying abroad in Canada, came. On 16-08-2025, Angadpal Singh gave me a special power of attorney in my name. I am presenting the same to you. While I have the special power of attorney given by Angadpal Singh with me, there are persons i.e. working in the house of my friend, the late Kanwaljeet Singh, Additional District Judge Sahib Sangrur, including Amarjot Kaur alias Pinky, Gaurav Goel son of Satpal Goel, resident of Power House Road, Main Chowk, Bathinda, a unknown person, and a government officer who was posted with my deceased friend, the late Kanwaljeet Singh, Additional District Judge (Sangrur), regarding whom I have concrete evidence. I will present this during the investigation after the case is registered. Until now, I have been investigating on my own regarding the accused, and now I have fully realized that these four individuals have committed theft from house of my friend, the late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge (Sangrur), at his house. Legal action should be taken against all four individuals for stealing ancestral gold, jewellery, and cash from the house of my friend, the late Kanwaljit Singh, Additional District Judge Sahib Sangrur, House No. 74C, Vikas Colony, Patiala, and for unauthorized entry into the house”.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner Bikramdeep Singh, Sh.Anish Jain and Sh.Amit Jain, Advocates vehemently argued that a false FIR on scandalous and false facts has been got registered to tarnish the image of the petitioner whose father and grandfather are also retired judicial officers. It was stated that there was a considerable delay in registration of the FIR which has been got registered without any

preliminary enquiry clearly showing the bias and malice on the part of the complainant. It was stated that the allegations are highly improbable and concocted. The learned counsel stated that there was no question of any criminal trespass since the petitioner/bail applicant shared friendly, family relations with the deceased who had been treating the petitioner as a family member from their posting together at district Ludhiana. They contended that on 01.08.2025 when the petitioner came to know about the untimely demise of Sh.Kanwaljit Singh at Amar Hospital, Patiala; due to the bonding shared with the deceased and out of gratuitous behaviour, the petitioner reached Amar Hospital and since no family member was present with the deceased; the petitioner contacted his son Angadpal Singh in Canada to express his condolences. Soon thereafter, the petitioner was asked by Angadpal Singh to visit his house immediately, showing concern with regard to family valuables lying in the house no.74-C, Vikas Colony, Patiala and he requested the petitioner to go to the house and to take into safe custody, the said articles and also told him that their trustworthy domestic help Amarjot Kaur alias Pinky who was also present in the hospital would assist him and accordingly the petitioner with *bona fide* intentions and to provide help to his close family friends went to the house of the deceased and on reaching there made a video call to Angadpal Singh narrating everything and even thereafter he remained in touch with him. Reliance has been placed by the learned counsel upon screen shots of WhatsApp chats (**Annexure-3**) to substantiate

communication with the son of the deceased.

4.1 Further it was emphasised that during his stay in India, Angadpal Singh initially stayed at the house of the petitioner where the petitioner handed over the belongings collected from the house of the deceased to Angadpal Singh on 04.08.2025. It was stated that since there were family relations between the petitioner and Angadpal Singh he did not take any formal receipt of handing over of the belongings. Further, the learned counsel would vehemently contend that there are CCTV cameras installed in the house of petitioner and there would have been recordings of Angadpal Singh while coming and leaving the house of the petitioner alongwith the belongings received from the petitioner in August, 2025 but the complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh Virk and Angadpal Singh deliberately chose to file the complaint at a late stage so that all the CCTV recordings would have been automatically deleted due to passage of time and the intervening gap of 7 months.

4.2 Further the learned counsel took up the plea that even the role of the complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh Virk is shady since he remained in touch and interacted with the petitioner. On 26.08.2025 he sent an invitation to the petitioner of a function at Rajiv Gandhi Law University and requested to meet the petitioner and used to send him greetings. Further the learned counsel stated that the allegations in the FIR are also vague as there are no details or descriptions or weight and shape of the articles, which has been done intentionally to manipulate the situation,

which is supported by the fact, that the FIR has been got registered after a gap of more than seven and a half months. Learned counsel vehemently contended that had, there been any dishonest intention on the part of the petitioner he would have not gone their personally, secondly he would not have been accompanied by the gunmen of the deceased, thirdly he would not have remained on call with Angadpal Singh for almost the entire time he remained in the house of the deceased, further he would not have been calling and conversing with the said Angadpal Singh even after the alleged date and incident and most importantly the petitioner would have taken away the DVR of the CCTV from the house of the deceased, if any wrongful act would have been intended, thus the conduct of the petitioner, as per the learned counsel, showed that there was no dishonest intention or theft or misappropriation much less criminal trespass as he had entered the house on the asking of the son of the deceased.

4.3 The learned counsel further stated that the police is not adhering to the guidelines set forth by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Delhi Judicial Service Association Vs. State of Gujarat* reported in 1991 AIR Supreme Court 2176. It was the contention of the learned counsel that the ratio of the said judgment provides immunity to the judicial officers from arrest. It was further argued that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner as a wrongful story has been concocted to malign the image of the petitioner who is a judicial officer performing his duties earnestly. Summing up their arguments the learned counsel

contended that the petitioner is willing and ready to join the investigation. He is a serving judicial officer and would abide by any condition so imposed by this court if granted the concession of bail. Hence, the prayer for pre-arrest bail.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State Sh.Charanjeet Singh Bhullar assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant Sh.HPS Verma, Advocate opposed the bail application submitting that the allegations are grave involving criminal breach of trust, theft of property of a very high value and magnitude. It was contended that the CCTV footages in the pendrive from the house where the offence was committed establish the presence and active participation of the petitioner in removing the articles. It was contended that the body language and conduct of the petitioner revealed from the CCTV footage shows the dishonest intention. It was stated that the petitioner has falsely taken the plea of having done everything at the instance of the son of the deceased whereas the time in the CCTV footage and the screenshots of the WhatsApp chats would reveal that the articles as per the CCTV footage were taken away by 21:50 hours whereas the first voice call as per **Annexure-3**, the screenshot of the WhatsApp relied upon by the petitioner is of 10:17 PM on 01.08.2025 and the video call is of 10:52 PM meaning thereby that the articles were taken away much before the petitioner Bikramdeep Singh contacted the sons of the deceased. It was stated by the Additional Public Prosecutor that the WhatsApp chats **Annexure-3** relied

upon by the petitioner do not disclose any entrustment or authorization to remove the valuables. Further it was vehemently contended that recovery of the case property is yet to be effected for which custodial interrogation would be required which is essential to unearth the conspiracy and to trace the property. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently contended that the statements of the two sons of the deceased, recorded in the investigation would reveal that the petitioner had asked them not to go to their house in Patiala due to security reasons, thus the sons of the deceased were kept away so that the acts of the petitioner and his co-accused would not be revealed. Further it was argued that the CCTV footages reveal the manner in which the articles are being removed. It was stated that the co-accused Amarjot Kaur and Gaurav Goyal have been arrested and their interrogation has also revealed, that the articles so taken away, were with the petitioner. Further it was stated that in view of the fact that the recovery is to be effected and the entire conspiracy is to be unearthed, the bail application may be dismissed.

6. On an appreciation of the contentions of the learned counsel Sh.Anish Jain and Sh.Amit Jain, Advocates on their plea for grant of pre-arrest bail to the bail applicant Bikramdeep Singh and the contentions of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State Sh.Charanjeet Singh Bhullar assisted by the counsel for the complainant Sh.HPS Verma, Advocate; opposing the bail application and having carefully gone through the investigation record, it is found that the primary question for

consideration is whether the petitioner has been able to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail in the light of the nature of allegations and the material collected during investigation. The jurisdiction to grant bail has to be exercised on the basis of the well settled principles having regard to the facts and circumstances of each case. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *Prahlad Singh Bhati Vs. NCT, Delhi and another* reported in **2001 (4) SCC 280** has held that the following factors are to be taken into consideration while considering an application for bail: - (i) *the nature of accusation and the severity of the punishment in the case of conviction and the nature of the materials relied upon by the prosecution;* (ii) *reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witnesses or apprehension of threat to the complainant or the witnesses;* (iii) *reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the time of trial or the likelihood of his abscondence;* (iv) *character behaviour and standing of the accused and the circumstances which are peculiar to the accused;* (v) *larger interest of the public or the State and similar other considerations.* It has also been held that each case has to be considered on its own facts and circumstances as well as merits. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab* reported in **1980 AIR 1632** while recognizing the power under section 438 Cr.P.C., the Hon'ble Apex Court held that such power is extraordinary and must be exercised sparingly depending upon the facts of each case. Further in *Jai Parkash Singh Vs. The State of Bihar Criminal Appeal Nos.525-526 of 2012*, it was held that anticipatory bail should not

be granted as a matter of rule, particularly where serious allegations are involved and investigation is at its initial stage.

7. Examining the factual matrix and circumstances of the present case in the light of the guidelines of the Hon'ble Apex Court, it is found that the allegations against the petitioner/bail applicant Bikramdeep Singh who is a serving judicial officer are of a serious nature; involving removal of a substantial quantity of gold and jewellery from the residence of a deceased colleague under suspicious circumstances. The offence alleged strikes at the integrity, expected from a public servant more particularly a judicial officer. Although it is alleged that the FIR has been got registered with a *mala fide* intention after a delay of 7 months but the investigation file would reveal that an application had been moved by the complainant to the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Patiala Range which was marked to the Superintendent of Police for inquiry into the matter. The CCTV footages in the pendrive, available with the record of investigation shows the bail applicant entering and exiting the premises with his co-accused, carrying certain boxes and bags. The CCTV footage, as pointed out by the prosecution, thus *prima facie* corroborates the presence of the petitioner Bikramdeep Singh at the scene alongwith the co-accused at the relevant time. The body language of the people in the CCTV footage including that of the petitioner and the manner in which the articles are being taken away *prima facie* shows that the act is being done in a clandestine manner. The WhatsApp chats relied upon by the

petitioner *prima facie* do not disclose any consent or authorization by the son of the deceased namely Angadpal Singh to remove the valuables from the house which fact is supported by the statements of both the sons of the deceased which are on the investigation file. The WhatsApp chats **Annexure-3** with the bail application merely reflect general communication regarding the arrival of Angadpal Singh in India and his emotional state. In fact the time in these WhatsApp chats and voice calls and video calls is post 10:15 PM whereas the CCTV footages are till 9:50 PM which is much prior to the communication with the said Angadpal Singh son of deceased, *prima facie* revealing that the articles were taken away prior to the contact of the petitioner with Angadpal Singh.

8. At this stage, the court is not required to conduct a mini trial or record any finding on merits, however the material on the record does not support the pleas taken up by the petitioner, sufficient to justify the protection of a pre-arrest bail. In *State represented by the C.B.I. Vs. Anil Sharma* reported in 1997 (7) SCC 187 the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented and effective than questioning a suspect who is well ensconded with a favourable order under section 438 of the Code and such protection should not be granted where it would impede effective investigation. Effective interrogation of the suspects usually leads to tremendous advantage in disinterring useful information and also materials which would have been concealed.

9. In context to the contention of the counsel for the petitioner/bail applicant that the applicant is a judicial officer and is entitled to special protection and immunity citing the observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court, it is found that in ***Delhi Judicial Service Association Vs. State of Gujarat*** reported in 1991 AIR Supreme Court 2176 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down guidelines to protect judicial officers from arbitrary arrest and it has been held that the guidelines are to be followed in the case of arrest and detention of a judicial officer. The judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court does not grant absolute immunity from criminal prosecution or investigation. The safeguards relate to the manner of arrest and not to exemption from arrest where circumstances so warrant it, rather the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that no person whatever his rank, or designation may be, is, above law and he must face the penal consequences of infraction of criminal law. A Magistrate, Judge or any other Judicial Officer is liable to criminal prosecution for an offence like any other citizen but in view of the paramount necessity of preserving the independence of judiciary, the guidelines have been issued.

10. The court, while exercising its discretion under section 482 of the BNSS is required to balance the individual liberty of the applicant with the interest of fair and effective investigation. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, considering the gravity of the allegations, the *prima facie* material in the form of CCTV footage, the absence of convincing material supporting lawful possession, the

requirement of recovery of substantial property, this court is of the view that grant of anticipatory bail would adversely affect the investigation.

11. In view of the foregoing discussion, this court does not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the bail applicant. Accordingly, the application is dismissed. Observations made herein are strictly for disposal of the bail application and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

Pronounced
Date of order: 01.04.2026

Bhavik

(Harinder Sidhu)
Additional Sessions Judge
Patiala/(UID No.PB00130)