



214(2) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20840-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 07.05.2025

KEVAL KRISHAN GOYAL

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ashim Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition is preferred under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.230 dated 25.11.2024 under Section 303 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Sections 305 & 317(2) of BNS were added and Section 303 of BNS was deleted later on), registered at Police Station Bajghera, District Gurugram.

2. On 28.04.2025, following order was passed:

"Instant petition is preferred under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.230 dated 25.11.2024 under Section 303 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Sections 305 & 317(2) of BNS were added and Section 303 of BNS was deleted later on), registered at Police Station Bajghera, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR. The investigating officer is acting malafidely for extraneous consideration and he has implicated number of persons. Further, the initial allegations are against co-accused Dhani Ram, who is real brother of the petitioner and stolen vehicle was recovered from the shop of co-accused Sonu. The petitioner accompanied co-accused Dhani Ram, when he went to join the investigation. Furthermore, the



petitioner has already approached this Court by way of filing a petition i.e. CRWP-3189- 2025 seeking directions to the official respondents especially respondent No.3 therein, to protect the life and liberty. The Investigating Officer, on his whims and fancies, is implicating innocent persons, who have no connection with the theft of vehicle in question. In the aforementioned criminal writ petition, this Court, vide order dated 01.04.2025, issued notice against the conduct of the Investigating Officer, for 19.05.2025. It is further contended that the petitioner has been nominated as accused in the FIR (supra) after a gap of four months. Co-accused of the petitioner, namely Jatinder Singh, has already been granted the concession of ad interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 07.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-19150-2025 (Annexure P-6) and now the same is fixed for hearing on 07.05.2025.

Notice of motion for 07.05.2025.

*To be heard along with **CRM-M-19150-2025 (Jatinder Singh Vs. State of Haryana).***

*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 petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer on or before 06.05.2025 and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall 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 petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner 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 on instructions from Investigating Officer submits that in compliance of order dated 28.04.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the statement made by learned State Counsel the order dated 28.04.2025, is made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

07.05.2025
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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