



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

107

CRM-M- 45902-2025

Date of decision: 22.08.2025

Rahul

.....*Petitioner**Versus*

State of Haryana

.....*Respondent***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Vinay Kumar Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl.AG, Haryana.

Mr. Shashi Kant Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

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

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in petitioner in case FIR No.0117 dated 16.07.2025 under Sections 190,191(3),115,351(2), 324(2),287,126(2) and 117(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act registered at P.S Bichhor, District Nuh.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are baseless. It is a no injury case and there is no direct evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged commission of offence.

Notice of motion.

**On behalf of the State**

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl.AG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who opposes the grant of anticipatory bail submitting that the petitioner tried to kill the complainant and therefore does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Analysis

Be that as it may, considering the fact that it is a no injury case and even empty shells were not recovered from the spot and no material document has been produced to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

5. 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 one week 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 one week 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

22.08.2025
manoj

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