

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:136278



(207)

CRM-M-25994-2025
Decided on : 29.09.2025

Sunil DhimanPetitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner (s).
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Dushyant Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.116 dated 18.04.2025 registered for offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of BNS 2023 (previously Sections 406 and 420 IPC) at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.
2. On 13.05.2025, the following order was passed:

“Petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in FIR No.116 dated 18.04.2025 registered under Sections 316(2) and 318(4) of BNS at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala.
Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the admitted case of the complainant, there were certain financial transactions between the parties and the FIR has been got registered by the complainant by exercising his influence over the police. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner had already returned the entire loan amount to the complainant prior to April 2023 through various modes of

payment. Out of the total amount of Rs.2 lac, a sum of Rs.45,000/- was returned through google pay and bank transfers and some amount was repaid in cash. He next submits that even though the petitioner had returned the entire amount and nothing was outstanding, as well. The FIR has been got registered by the complainant illegally.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, while Mr.Dushyant Rana, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-complainant.

Heard.

List on 30.07.2025.

At this stage, without commenting on the rival contentions made by the leaned counsel for the parties, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation. In the event of arrest, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of arresting/investigating officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C./482 (2) of BNSS, 2023.

With the consent of both the parties, the matter is referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and the parties are directed to appear before it on 20.05.2025.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/serious in nature and hence he ought not to be granted concession of anticipatory bail. He has further iterated that and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may flee from the process of justice as also intimidate/influence the witnesses.

5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and her custodial interrogation is not required, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 13.05.2025 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

September 29, 2025

Naveen

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No