

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:168016



(211)

CRM-M-16456-2025
Decided on : 03.12.2025
Uploaded on : 03.12.2025

Satbir @ Satveer

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Gurasis Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sankalp Gehlawat, Advocate for the petitioner (s).

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.90 dated 22.03.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 323, 325, 307, 506 of IPC, at Police Station Badli, District Jhajjar; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.
2. On 26.03.2025, the following order was passed:

“Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.90 dated 22.03.2023 under Sections 323, 325, 307, 506 of the IPC registered at Police Station Badli, District Jhajjar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the occurrence in question took place on 22.03.2023 wherein even as per the allegations levelled in the FIR by the complainant herself, she was inflicted a single blow on her head with an iron

rod by the petitioner. On being medically examined by the doctors soon after the alleged occurrence, the injury allegedly sustained by the complainant was opined to be simple in nature. However, strangely and shockingly after one and a half years of the alleged occurrence, an offence under Section 308 of the IPC was added on account of some fracture sustained by the complainant on her skull which was then substituted with an offence under Section 307 of the IPC.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 01.05.2025.

Meanwhile, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner only till the next date of hearing.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 28.08.2025 the interim protection earlier afforded to the petitioner was ordered to be continued.
4. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.
5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he is not required for further custodial interrogation, the petition is allowed and the order dated 26.03.2025 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.
6. 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.

7. 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 Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

December 03, 2025

Naveen

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No