



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

207

CRM-M-32666-2025 O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 11.07.2025

ASHISH

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Sunil Sihag, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Prayer**

This petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.66, dated 20.05.2025, under Sections 115, 126, 127(2), 138, 190, 191(2), 308(2), 351(3) & 140(3) (Added later on), of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh.

2. Contentions**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that as per the allegations, the petitioner is allegedly involved in illegally obstructing the truck bearing registration No. HR47G-7059



and wrongfully confining the driver of the said truck which was loaded with stones and demanded Rs. 1 lakh per month to allow the plying of the truck on the road of village Rajawas whereas the fact is that the Gram Panchayat Jerpur constituted a committee of 8 persons including the petitioner to restrain the over loaded truck from plying on the roads of village Jerpur and the petitioner was just doing his duty and he stopped the above said truck and handed over the same to the RTO Officers on the same day i.e. 18.05.2025 due to its overloading with stones. He further submits that the matter has been compromised between the parties, therefore prays for grant of anticipatory bail. He points out that co-accused Santosh and Mohit have also been granted concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 11.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-32894-2025 and co-accused Sandeep has also been granted concession of bail vide order dated 02.05.2025 by the Trial Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State and counsel for the complainant

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that there are allegation of extorting the money from truck owners whose trucks ply on the road and pass through the village Jerpur.



Learned counsel for the complainant submits that he has no objection if anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners as the matter has been compromised between the parties.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, after given a thoughtful consideration to the submissions as made, by the counsel for both the parties to the effect that the matter has been compromised between the parties, nothing is to be recovered from the present petitioners, co-accused persons namely Santosh and Mohit have also been granted concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 11.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-32894-2025 and co-accused Sandeep has also been granted concession of bail vide order dated 02.05.2025 by the Trial Court, hence, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail, wherein the petitioner has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period.

4. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-



‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.07.2025
anuradha

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