



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
106

CRM-M-35577-2026
Decided on: 15.07.2026

ANKIT
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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
Ankit, aged about 26 years	0175	01.06.2026	115, 140(3), 3(5) of BNS [corresponding to sections 323, 365, 34 of IPC] and section 117(2) of BNS added later on [corresponding to section 325 of IPC]	Sonepat Sadar	Sonepat

2. On 06.07.2026, following order was passed:-

“1. xxxx xxxx xxxx xxx
2. On oral request, complainant namely Aksh, son of Virender Singh, resident of Vikas Nagar,



Kakaroi Road, is hereby ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Let amended memo of parties in this regard, be filed by counsel for the petitioner, directly in the Registry, within a period of two days from today.

3. *As per allegations in the FIR, complainant, Aksh, had taken a car on rent from his neighbour, Ankit (present petitioner), for a few days. Before the vehicle was returned, it allegedly met with an accident in which it sustained damage to its rear side. Complainant got the vehicle repaired and thereafter returned it to the petitioner. It is further alleged that an amount of Rs.25,000/- remained payable by the complainant, who assured the petitioner that the same would be paid after a few days.*

Prosecution further alleges that, owing to the said dispute, on 30.05.2026, petitioner called the complainant to ITI Chowk. Upon reaching there, complainant was allegedly made to sit in an i-10 car occupied by the petitioner, co-accused Andaz, Rahul Panchal, and another unidentified person. Complainant was then taken to a katcha road, where the petitioner and co-accused Rahul allegedly threatened him, stating that he had been kidnapped and would be taught a lesson. It is specifically alleged that co-accused Rahul Panchal repeatedly assaulted the complainant with a kada, inflicting blows on his head, near the ears, and on his face. Complainant was allegedly beaten, until he became unconscious and, upon regaining consciousness, found himself admitted to a hospital.

4. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that of extending criminal intimidation, and no overt act of assault or specific injury has been attributed to him. It is argued that, as per the prosecution case itself, the injuries were inflicted by co-accused Rahul Panchal with a kada. Learned counsel further submits that FIR does not indicate that complainant suffered any grievous injury or injury dangerous to life. It is also submitted that petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, provided he is protected from arrest. Thus, counsel prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*



6. *On advance notice, Mr. Pawan Kumar Garg, DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and submits that one of the co-accused namely Rahul has already been arrested.*

7. *Adjourned to 15.07.2026.
To be shown in the urgent list.*

8. *Looking at the circumstances in entirety, it appears that there is a small dispute and both the parties are known to each other, rather, they are residing in the neighbourhood of each other.*

9. *In order to explore the possibility of resolving controversy and to obviate unnecessary litigation that continues to burden the Court, petitioner as well as respondent No.2/complainant are directed to remain present before this Court on the next date of hearing. However, in case, any other co-accused also wishes to remain present, he shall be at liberty to do so.*

10. *Let respondent No.2/complainant be informed about the next date of hearing, by the concerned SHO of the police station.*

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

12. *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.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 06.07.2026, 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. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 06.07.2026, 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.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

15.07.2026

Lavisha

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