

2025:PHHC:065788



204.

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

CRM-M-20088-2025

Date of decision: 16.05.2025

Sushma @ Sushma Devi and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Komal Rana, Advocate, for
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in FIR No.151, dated 13.03.2025, under Sections 190, 191(3), 115(2), 118(2), 238 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 09.04.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, a coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioners and asked them to join investigation:-

“The aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint lodged by the complainant Om Parkash alleging therein that on 08.03.2025 the petitioner by forming an unlawful assembly with the coaccused and in prosecution of common object thereof had opened an assault upon them and has caused simple as well as grievous injuries to him. The petitioners had through brickbats on him. After registration of the FIR investigation proceedings have been initiated and are

underway. Apprehending their arrest the petitioners moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail which had been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra vide order dated 04.04.2025.

It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of five days in reporting the matter to the police, which has not been satisfactorily explained by the complainant. The injuries which have been attributed to the petitioners are simple in nature. Subject offences are not made out against them. Accordingly, it is urged that the petitioners deserve to be given concession of pre-arrest bail.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of order dated 09.04.2025, petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioners are not required for further investigation much less for their custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 09.04.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 16, 2025
sanjeev

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