



CRM-M-8803-2025 and
CRM-M-8829-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-8803-2025

Vikram

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
209-2

.....Respondent
CRM-M-8829-2025

Surender @ Motu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent
Decided on: 20.05.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioner(s)
(in both cases)

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The aforementioned petitions are being disposed of by way of a common order, as they arise out of the same FIR.
2. The present petitions have been filed by Vikram (petitioner in CRM-M-8803-2025) and Surender @ Motu (petitioner in CRM-M-8829-2025) under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.23 dated 12.09.2023 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, registered at Police Station Cyber City, Hisar.
3. On 15.02.2025, following order was passed:



“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vikram, Surender @ Motu	23	12.09.2023	420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC	Cyber City	Hisar

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, inter alia, contends that allegations in both the petitions against the petitioners, is that the complainant i.e. Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited (RJIL) moved a complaint for initiating action for using multiple names against the same photograph of the customer for activating the mobile connections. As per the contents of the complaint, LSA Field Unit of DoT Haryana LSA, observed that multiple names appeared against the same photograph of the subscribers in different CAFs.

Against both the petitioners, three different FIRs have been registered at the same Police Station i.e. Cyber Crime, Hisar, in FIR No.23, 24 and 25 dated 12.09.2023.

3. Counsel for the petitioners contends that in connection with FIR No.23 dated 12.09.2023, both the petitioners remained in custody for a period of about two months, and thereupon, vide order dated 05.02.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, they were granted the concession of regular bail.

Further submits that once, they have been arrested by the police of the same police station in one of the case i.e. FIR No.23 dated 12.09.2023, there cannot be any substantial reason to arrest the petitioners in all the FIRs again and again. Because at the time of custodial interrogation, expectedly a comprehensive interrogation/investigation might have already been conducted by the police. Therefore, custodial interrogation would not serve any useful purpose in the present case, separately.

Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions, and to file status report in the matter.

6. Adjourned to 23.04.2025.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating



**CRM-M-8803-2025 and
CRM-M-8829-2025**

3

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 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, the 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.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that, as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. However, it is submitted that the petitioners be directed to rejoin the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer. It is further clarified that in the event of non-cooperation or failure to join the investigation when called upon, the petitioners shall not be entitled to claim the benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. After going through the paper-book and hearing learned State counsel, and upon perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR as well as the issues highlighted during the course of hearing, and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners have joined the investigation and have extended full cooperation, and that custodial interrogation is not required as of now, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petitions. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is accepted. The interim order dated 15.02.2025 is hereby made absolute. Petitions thus, allowed.

6. However, the petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and shall



**CRM-M-8803-2025 and
CRM-M-8829-2025**

4

abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS, 2023).

It is further clarified that in the event the petitioners fails to join or rejoin the investigation despite service of due notice by the Investigating Officer, it shall be open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of the anticipatory bail.

Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

7. Accordingly, petitions stand disposed of.
8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

May 20, 2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**