



CRA-S-2549-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRA-S-2549-2025

Decided on: 19.11.2025

Priyanshu Bhati

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Karandeep, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the order dated 06.08.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Narnaul, whereby anticipatory bail petition filed by the appellant has been dismissed, in case, FIR No.47 dated 02.05.2025, under Sections 115, 191(2), 191(3), 351(3) of BNS and Sections 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act, registered at Police Station City Kanina, District Mahendegarh.

2. On 21.08.2025, following order was passed:

“(i) Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the order dated 06.08.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Narnaul, whereby anticipatory bail petition filed by the appellant has been dismissed, in case, FIR No.47 dated 02.05.2025, under Sections 115, 191(2), 191(3), 351(3) of BNS and Sections 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act, registered at Police Station City Kanina, District Mahendegarh.

(ii) Learned counsel for the appellant, inter alia, contends that co-

**CRA-S-2549-2025**

accused namely Rakshak Lamba @ Rakshak and Devender @ Devender Singh @ Jony, who are attributed with almost similar roles, have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide common order dated 29.07.2025, passed in CRA-S-2015-2025 and CRA-S-2016-2025.

(iii) It is further submitted that, as per the FIR, allegation against the appellant is that he struck the complainant with a beer bottle on the head and also allegedly assaulted him with a stick. However, none of the injuries attributed to the appellant are serious or grievous in nature. The applicability of the offence under the SC/ST Act remains uncertain at this stage, and same is an issue, to be determined by the trial court, after thorough examination of the evidence, which is yet to be led by the prosecution. Moreover, appellant is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the appellant in the present case.

(iv) Notice of motion.

(v) On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.

However, to prevent loss to the State Exchequer, the appearance of the concerned respondent(s) in the subsequent proceedings will only be recognized, if the requisite process fee is deposited by the petitioner(s), within a period of one week from today.

(vi) Adjourned to 19.11.2025..

(vii) In the meanwhile, the appellant is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the appellant shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The appellant shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

(viii) Besides, it is directed that appellant 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



CRA-S-2549-2025

passport.

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

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the appellant contends that in compliance to the order dated 21.07.2025 passed by this Court, appellant has joined the investigation on 12.11.2025.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report in the Court today, which is taken on record. He on instructions from ASI Sneh Lata confirms the said averment made by counsel for the appellant of joining the investigation on 12.11.2025 by the appellant, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the appellant is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, appellant has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 21.08.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present appeal is allowed.

However, appellant 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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.11.2025

reena

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

~~YES/NO~~
~~YES/NO~~