



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

208

CRM-M-9449-2025

Date of decision: 04.04.2025

Abhishek

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. S.N. Pillania, Advocate,
Mr. Devesh Nehra, Advocate and
Mr. Ankit Yadav, 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 the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.212 dated 13.04.2022 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323 of the IPC (Section 302 of the IPC added lateron) registered at Police Station Narnaund, District Hansi.

2. On 18.02.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to appear and surrender before the learned Trial Court on or before 03.03.2025:-

“Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner was found innocent during investigation and placed in column No.2. During the course of trial an application under Section 319



Cr.P.C. was moved, which was allowed and leading to the summoning of the petitioner as an additional accused. It has been contended that all the co-accused, who had been initially chargesheeted had already been granted bail on account of the fact that even as per the case of the prosecution fatal injuries have not been attributed to them but to co-accused Vikas and Sachin. Learned counsel has contended that only presence of the petitioner is alleged at the time of occurrence in question and the fatal injuries have not been attributed to him. Therefore, there is a genuine apprehension on his part that he could be arrested and sent to custody when he appears before the Trial Court. Still further in the above facts and circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required as it would not serve any useful purpose.”

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 18.02.2025, the petitioner has appeared and surrendered before the learned Trial Court, and thereafter released on interim bail vide order dated 24.02.2025. In support, learned counsel has placed on record a copy of order dated 24.02.2025 of the learned Trial Court wherein the said fact stands confirmed.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having appeared and surrendered before the learned Trial Court, and thereafter released on bail.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 18.02.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

04.04.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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