



106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40653-2025 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 30.07.2025

NARENDER

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Tanmoy Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

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

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 73 dated 18.03.2024 registered under Section 148/149/323/452/506 IPC, 1860 (Section 325 and 307 IPC added later on) at P.S. Mundkati, District Palwal, Haryana.

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 has referred to the affidavit (Annexure P-4) filed by complainant Jeetan wherein he has specifically stated that due to misunderstanding he had named Narender @ Naren and Manoj @ Manohar in his statement and



the case was registered against them also and further stating that they have nothing to do with our case.

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

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer in view of the affidavit (Annexure P-4) filed by complainant is not in a position to controvert prayer made by the petitioner through this petition.

3. **Analysis**

After given a thoughtful consideration to the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and in view of the affidavit Annexure P-4 given by the complainant to the extent that due to a misunderstanding, he had mentioned Narender @ Naren and Manoj @ Manohar in his statement, resulting in the case being registered against them as well and he has further stated that they have no connection with the present case. 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

30.07.2025
anuradha

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