

CRM-M-21700-2025
Date of decision: 23.05.2025

...PETITIONER

V/S

...RESPONDENT

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR (supra). Only a scuffle took place and the real facts were twisted just to add the offence under Section 140(1) of BNS. Further, the son of the complainant remained at his house. It is further contended that similarly situated co-accused Tejpal @ Teju has already been granted the



concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 21.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-10088-2025 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 23.05.2025.

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 petitioner is 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 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 ASI Pardeep Singh, submits that in compliance of order dated 25.04.2025 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 25.04.2025, is made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 482(2) BNSS, 2023 (*Erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.*)

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

May 23, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No