



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

CRM-M-37466-2025

Date of Decision:17.07.2025

NARESH KUMAR

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
Mr. Pradeep Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR 176 dated 13.05.2025 under Section 115(2), 140(3), 3(5), 351(2) of BNS 2023, registered at Police Station Sirsa Sadar, District Sirsa, Haryana.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the case as no injury has been attributed to the him as per the FIR. The petitioner has neither caused any injury nor has threatened the complainant. He further submits that co-accused Sourav has been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court vide order dated 01.07.2025 in CRM-M-33291 of 2025. He undertakes, on instructions, that petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and shall appear as and when required.



Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner alongwith co-accused gave injuries to the complainant.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, upon due consideration of the submissions advanced and, in particular, taking note of the fact that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner, and further considering that the co-accused has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 01.07.2025 in CRM-M-33291-2025, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted at this stage.

In the light of above, this Court finds no cogent or compelling reason to deny bail to the petitioner, particularly when he has expressed *bona fide* intent, and has undertaken to join and cooperate with the investigation so as to enable timely submission of the final report by the Investigating Agency.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to her joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. 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 one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

17.07.2025

kv

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