



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

**CRM-M-28385-2025
Date of decision: 03.09.2025**

SANDEEP**....Petitioner**

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA**....Respondent****CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present:- Mr. Surinder Singh Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG Haryana.

.....
RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS"), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.784 dated 26.11.2024 under Sections 420, 406, 506, 34 IPC (Sections 467, 468 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 02.07.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

3. On 02.07.2025, following order had been passed: -

“ Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.784 dated 26.11.2024 under Sections 420, 406, 506, 34 of the IPC (Sections 467, 468 of the IPC added lateron) registered at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa.

Reply by way of affidavit of Vikas Krishan, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, has been filed in the Court today which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions. A copy of the same has been supplied to the counsel opposite.



Learned State counsel on being pointedly asked, on instructions, has not disputed that other than the present FIR, there is no other FIR registered against the petitioner much less involving similar allegations. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that there is not even a single monetary transaction alleged between the petitioner and the complainant. However, learned State counsel has submitted that there was some monetary transactions between the wife of the petitioner and co-accused Vipul and another transaction wherein some money had been transferred by the wife of the petitioner into the bank account of the complainant.

On being pointedly asked as to whether the wife of the petitioner was an accused in the present case, learned State counsel, on instructions, has replied in the negative.

Adjourned to 03.09.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and appear before the investigating agency as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.”

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

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 02.07.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

03.09.2025
puneet

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