

2025:PHHC:050423



207.

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

CRM-M-904-2025

Date of decision: 21.04.2025

Aman

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ran Vijay Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in FIR No.393, dated 28.11.2023, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 285, 323, 427, 435, 447, 506 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kasola, District Rewari.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 13.01.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that a perusal of the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1 reveals that the petitioner has not been named therein nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the occurrence in question; the petitioner came to be arraigned as an accused on the disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused, who claimed that petitioner was one of the unidentified persons, who had accompanied the main accused Rakesh Chugh and Amit to the place of occurrence and thereafter indulged in

vandalism as well as fired in the air. Learned counsel has further asserted that even in the disclosure statement, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. Still further, the two prime accused, who actively participated in the occurrence in question and who were specifically named and attributed a role, have since been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by Hon'ble the Supreme Court."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 13.01.2025, petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 13.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 21, 2025
sanjeev

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