

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:146861



(101-B)

CRM-M-14002-2020
Decided on : 28.10.2025

NaveenPetitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana and anotherRespondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Ms. Prannita Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.352 dated 03.12.2018 registered for offences punishable under Sections 120-B, 153-A, 504, 505, 506 IPC and Sections 3(1) (n)(q)(r)(z) (za), 3(2) (v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, at Police Station Sadar Hansi, District Hisar; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., seeking pre-arrest bail.
2. On 04.06.2020, the following order was passed by this Court:

“Petitioner is a juvenile and is son of Dharambir @ Kalu Ram, who has already been released on bail vide order dated 13.05.2020.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Deepak Sabharwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Adjourned to 14.07.2020.

To be heard along with CRM-M-12218-2020.

Keeping in view the order dated 13.05.2020 (Annexure P-8), this petition is being converted into a regular bail application and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of concerned Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.”

3. The order dated 13.05.2020 passed in the connected petition i.e. CRM-M-12229-2020 whereby the petitioners were granted the concession of ad-interim anticipatory bail, was challenged before the Hon’ble Supreme Court and the same has been upheld vide order dated 08.10.2025 passed in SLP (Crl.) No.2900 of 2020, relevant whereof reads thus:

“1. We have heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

2.Learned standing counsel for the respondent-State submitted that the impugned order is dated 13.05.2020; that respondent-accused(s) have been granted the benefit of bail; that they are also cooperating with the trial; there is also peace prevailing in the village.

3. In the circumstances, we do not think it just and proper to interfere in the matters.

4. Hence, the Special Leave Petitions are dismissed.

5. Pending applications including deletion shall stand disposed of”

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the interim order dated 04.06.2020 passed by this Court having affirmed by Hon’ble Supreme Court and there is no

allegation of having misused the concession of interim bail earlier afforded to him, the petition is allowed and the order dated 04.06.2020 granting bail to the petitioner is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Cr.P.C.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Cr.P.C. or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

28.10.2025

Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No