



Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the appellant and respondent No. 2-complainant were earlier having friendly terms which turned sour later on and on account of this the FIR in question has been registered against the appellant; earlier also one FIR No. 00527 dated 16.12.2021 for offences punishable under Sections 3(1)14,3(2) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and Section 67 of Information Technology Act, Sections 186, 354A,354D,506,509 IPC, Police Station Civil Line Sirsa was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2 against the appellant which was settled; there are telephonic talks/Whatsapp messages/bank transactions between the appellant and respondent No. 2 which reflect that they did have friendly relations with each other; no recovery is required to be made from the appellant; the appellant is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate has filed Vakalatnama for the complainant-respondent No. 2. The same be taken on record.

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

Adjourned to 21.10.2024.

The appellant is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 13.09.2024 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the appellant shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the appellant shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jasbir has stated that pursuant to the order dated 10.09.2024, the appellant has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.



CRA-S-3060 of 2024 **3**

4. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant-respondent No. 2 has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant by arguing that the allegations made against the appellant are serious in nature and hence anticipatory bail ought not to be granted to the appellant.
5. In view of above, the interim order dated 10.09.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.
6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting appellant indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the appellant violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

21.10.2024
P.Singh

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