



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-10380-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.03.2025

Ravinder Kumar @ Ravi Malik
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Anuj Tanwar, Advocate
for Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Naveen K. Kuhad, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.767 dated 09.12.2024 under Sections 108/3(5) of BNS registered at Police Station City Hansi, District Hisar.

2. On 24.02.2025, the following order was passed:-

“XX XX XX XX
Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner along with three persons was named as an accused in the FIR (supra). The petitioner has no dealing with the deceased and the Investigating Agency could not collect any evidence to show that the petitioner owed any money to the deceased or he even threatened the deceased or met him immediately prior to his death. He



further contends that the jurisdictional police authorities have scanned the call details of the deceased and his wife and no incriminating evidence has been found to connect the petitioner with the instigation and further, the factual ingredients for constituting the offence of abetment is clearly missing.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl.A.G., Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

In the meantime, keeping in view the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833, at the first instance, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer within two weeks from today and on his doing so or in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482 (2) of BNSS (earlier Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.).

If the Investigating/Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Investigating/Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.



Adjourned to 24.03.2025.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Kapil Dev, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the name of the petitioner and 03 others were duly mentioned in the suicide note.
5. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 24.02.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS (*erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*).
6. The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

24.03.2025
yakub

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