



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

104

CRM-M-908-2025

Decided on : 13.01.2025

Vinay Kumar Sharma @ Raju and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG-cum-PP, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who have been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 115(2)/118(1)/351(2)/191(3)/190 of BNS, 2023, in a case arising out of FIR No.109, dated 26.08.2024, registered at Police Station 'E' Division, Amritsar (Annexure P-1).

2. Contention of the petitioners is that already matter has been compromised and in consequence thereto, on filing the compromise quashing petition i.e. CRM-M-57045-2024, titled as, "Vinay Kumar Sharma alias Raju and others vs. State of Punjab and others" and in compliance to order dated 28.11.2024 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, qua the genuineness of the compromise, parties have already recorded their statements before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

3. The common fault of all the petitioners is that despite granting



of the anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Court, they did not join the investigation. Resultantly, the relief already granted to them was rejected. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioners expresses regret for the lapse and prays that once again concession of anticipatory bail be granted to the petitioners.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG-cum-PP, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State and pleads no objection to the prayer made by the petitioners.

6. At this stage, Ms. Nandini Sharma, Advocate for Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3 (complainants) and files *Vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. She also accepts all the contentions addressed by counsel for the petitioners in Court.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the record available before the Court.

8. I do not find any reason to invite any response from the side of the respondents and thus, keeping in view the submissions, as recorded above, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not going to serve any purpose. Accordingly, prayer of anticipatory bail is allowed on the strength of arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners and having been accepted by the respondents (complainants).

9. Consequently, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their



furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

10. Besides, petitioners would submit/surrender their passport before the Arresting Officer and an undertaking on oath that in case of leaving the Country, they would seek prior permission from the Investigating Agency/concerned Court.

11. Petition stands **disposed of** accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 13, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*