



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

107

CRM-M-36156-2025

*Date of decision: 11.07.2025***Krishan Kumar***.....Petitioner**Versus***State of Punjab***.....Respondents***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.172 dated 18.11.2022 under Sections 409,467,468,471,120-B IPC registered at P.S Anaj Mandi, District Patiala.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case in hand. He has nothing to do with the instant matter as he is not the beneficiary of any transaction. The petitioner has been nominated after almost two and half years of registration of the FIR added with the fact that the main co-accused Harshvardhan Duggal, who was initially nominated has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated



21.03.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-15339-2025. Petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigating Agency as and when called upon to do so.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State counsel does not controvert the aforesaid facts but opposes the prayer.

3. **Analysis**

Having perused the contents of the petition and in the light of the fact that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused after almost two and half years of registration of the FIR added with the fact that the main co-accused Harshvardhan Duggal has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 21.03.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-15339-2025, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no more deemed necessary at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

4. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of 10 days from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 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 a period of ten days and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.07.2025
manoj

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No