



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

211

CRM-M-1176-2025**Date of decision: April 24, 2025**

KALLU @ ISLAM

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.322 dated 26.08.2023 under Sections 395, 397, 412 of the IPC (Section 392 and 34 deleted later on and Section 412 added later on), and Sections 25 (1-B)(a) and 27 of the Arms Act (Section 27 added later on), registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Gurugram.

2. After issuing notice of motion on 20.01.2025, the petitioner had been granted interim bail by this Court vide, with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the order dated 20.01.2025 reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner was not named as an accused in the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1. He came to be nominated subsequently in a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused Khalid, and in the disclosure statement also, it was merely claimed that the petitioner was present with the co-accused.



It has also been submits that identically placed co-accused Yamin has already been extended the concession of bail vide order dated 18.09.2024 by this Court.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that in compliance of order dated 20.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Status report by way of an affidavit of the Commissioner of Police, Pataudi, Gurugram on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed in the Court today, which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

5. 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 their custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed, and interim order dated 20.01.2025 is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

April 24, 2025

Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*