

CRM-M-31043-20251

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212CRM-M-31043-2025
Decided on: 12.08.2025

Madhav Kumar.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Shivam Kamboj Sirsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Madhav Kumar, About 23 years	27	08.04.2025	316(4), 336(2), 336(4), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 72-A of Information Technology Act	Division No.7	Jalandhar

2. On 29.05.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Madhav	27	08.04.2025	316(4),	Division	Jalandhar

Kumar, About 23 years			336(2), 336(4), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 72- A of Informatio n Technolog y Act	No.7	
-----------------------------	--	--	---	------	--

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the allegation against the petitioner is that while serving in the complainant company, he has transferred the data and misused it un-authorisedly, thereby caused loss of an amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- to the complainant company. Further submits that present criminal case has been got registered vindictively by the complainant company because the petitioner had demanded his two months' salary and incentives for which he is actually entitled. In fact, no actual loss has been suffered by the complainant company because of the act having been done by the petitioner. Also submits that for examining the allegation levelled against the petitioner by the investigating agency, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required.

Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent - State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report.

5. Adjourned to 12.08.2025.

6. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency.

In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

7. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

**CRM-M-31043-2025****3**

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 29.05.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 02.07.2025 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 29.05.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

12.08.2025
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**