



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

CRM-M-3513-2025

Date of Decision:25.04.2025

Sandeep Kumar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. R.S.Rai, Senior Advocate with
 Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocate and
 Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No. 0014 dated 15.06.2024 registered under Sections 327, 347, 384, 388, 120-B and Sections 7 & 7-A of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, at Police Station ACB Hisar, District Anti-Corruption Bureau, Haryana.

2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 10.02.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner was not initially named in the FIR nor there was any averment, which even remotely connects him with the commission of crime. He further contends that during the course of investigation, the police had recovered an audio recording of conversation between the complainant and Sanchit, co-accused. However, even from the said recording, the

involvement of the petitioner cannot be inferred. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the only evidence against the petitioner is that the tower location of the petitioner was matching with the tower location of the other co-accused and it is unsafe to prosecute the petitioner on the strength of such a weak evidence. He further contends that the custodial interrogation may not be required in the peculiar facts of the present case. Apart from that, Ankush, Sanchit and Sunil, co-accused were arrested by the police and have already been granted the concession of bail.”

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.

4. Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 10.02.2025, passed by this Court is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

25.04.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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