



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

CRM-M-27383-2025

Date of Decision: 12.08.2025

Robin

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present:- Mr. R.K. Girdhwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Sr. DAG, Haryana

Mr. Khushwant Saharan, advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.178, dated 16.07.2024, under Sections 331(3), 305 and 3(5) of B.N.S, registered at Police Station Salhawas, Jhajjar (Annexure P-1).

2. While granting the concession of anticipatory bail on 19.05.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that Amit, complainant is having a matrimonial dispute with his wife Aditi. It has been alleged by the prosecution that the petitioner had allegedly gone with Aditi in a vehicle bearing No.DL-9CAV-5742 and had allegedly stolen gold and silver ornaments from the house of the complainant. Learned counsel further submits that Aditi, co-accused has already been granted the concession of bail by the Court of Additional

Sessions Judge, Jhajjar by observing that the CCTV footage did not show the persons, who were sitting in the vehicle and there was no evidence to show that Aditi/other accused had stolen the gold and silver ornaments from the house of the complainant. Learned counsel further submits that even there was no evidence to connect him with the commission of crime. Even, he is ready to join the investigation in the present case”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates the above submissions and submits that in compliance of the order dated 19.05.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the State on instructions from ASI Rajiv has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is facing 04 more criminal cases and does not deserve the concession of bail.

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

7. In the present case, apparently, the complainant is having a matrimonial dispute with his wife Aditi, who is also an accused in the present case. Even, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence as to whether Aditi, i.e., the wife of the complainant and petitioner had stolen the ornaments from the house of the complainant. The recovery, if any, has already been effected. Even, the petitioner is no longer required for the purpose of investigation before the IO of the case.

8. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the Cr.P.C. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

12.08.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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