



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

CRM-M-25792-2025

Date of Decision:05.08.2025

Munfed

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajeev Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.145, dated 29.06.2024 registered under Sections 420, 467, 447, 471, 506 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Dhauj, District Faridabad.

2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 12.05.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that 11 persons were arrayed as accused in the present FIR. However, co-accused, namely, Yakub, Sule Khan, Saraju, Usman and Sahil filed a petition i.e. CRM-M-34672-2024 before this Court with a prayer to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to them and the said petition was allowed by this Court on 13.08.2024. Even five other co-accused, namely, Abdul Hamid @ Hamid, Samaraddin, Najbuddin,

Harun and Shahjad also filed a petition before this Court i.e. CRM-M-39828-2024 with a prayer to grant the anticipatory bail to them and the said petition was also allowed on 20.08.2024. He further submits that the petitioner is also similarly placed with the said accused”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the present case, the petitioner has joined the investigation with the I.O of the present case and has co-operated during the process of investigation.

4. On the other hand learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Vinod has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has not joined the investigation.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. In the present case, five co-accused, who are similarly placed have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Even, the petitioner was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail and it is highly unbelievable that after grant of interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner has not joined the investigation with the I.O of the present case. Even, in the considered opinion of this Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

7. In view of the above statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the interim order dated 12.05.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

05.08.2025

hitesh

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