

CRM-M-11429-2025

-1-

2025-PHHC-071979



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

287 (2)

CRM-M-11429-2025

Date of Decision: 26.05.2025

GAURAV

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Singh Saini, Advocate
for the complainant.

N. S. SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.275, dated 05.10.2024, under Section 115(2), 351(3), 109(1), 3(5) & 117(2) (added later) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Chhachhrauli, District Yamuna Nagar (Annexure P-1).

2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 01.03.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-



“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, the allegations have been levelled against Sandeep Kumar and three unknown persons, who had allegedly come with him. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been arrayed as an accused in the supplementary statement of the complainant. He further contends that the great grandfather of petitioner and grandfather of the complainant were brothers and the house of the petitioner is adjacent to the house of the complainant. The petitioner is nephew of the complainant in relation and he has been described as unknown person in the FIR. Learned counsel further contends that the co-accused Sandeep Kumar has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 24.10.2024 (Annexure P-3).”

3. Learned 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 above statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the interim order dated 01.03.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when



called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

26.05.2025.
vipin

(N. S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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