



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-5244-2025

Date of decision: May 15th, 2025

Sikender

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Bijender Dhankhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.401 dated 11.07.2024 under Sections 103(1), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station City, Hansi, District Hisar.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 30.01.2025, following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner were recorded:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR in question nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the alleged murder. Rather, he came to be nominated as an accused much later on a disclosure statement alleged suffered by co-accused Parveen alias Monu, who claimed that the petitioner had provided shelter to the prime accused about ten days prior to the alleged occurrence.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 13.02.2025, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join

investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned State counsel has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that the only role attributed to the petitioner is of having provided shelter to the prime accused ten days prior to the occurrence in question.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner accompanied the co-accused/prime accused at the time of the alleged occurrence or in any manner provided the weapons of offence, learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Sadanand, has replied in the negative.

On a further query as to whether the petitioner had provided any shelter to the prime accused after the occurrence in question, learned State counsel, on instructions, has yet again replied in the negative. It has only been submitted that the petitioner was a friend of the prime accused.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 13.02.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

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 his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 13.02.2025 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

May 15th, 2025

Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

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