



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-14976-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.04.2025

Romi @ Deewan Masih and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate
and Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Rakhra, Advocate
and Ms. Gurvinder Kaur, 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.05 dated 31.01.2025 under Sections 331(1), 305(a), 324(5), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur.

2. On 20.03.2025, the following order was passed:-

“XX XX XX XX

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that there is a delay of 42 hours in registration of FIR (supra), which creates a serious dent on the prosecution story. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners. Further, particulars and description of



stolen property have not been given and only bald allegations have been levelled just to aggravate the offence to make it non-bailable.

Notice of motion for 21.04.2025.

*Keeping in view the ratio of 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**, the petitioners are directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioners will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioners will cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).*

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

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.”



3. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and on instructions from ASI Bikram Singh, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioners have joined the investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required.
4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 20.03.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioners 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*).
5. The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

21.04.2025
yakub

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