



219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45671-2025
Decided on: 12.11.2025

Satish Kumar Petitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.PC.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder-

Name & age of petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Sections	Police Station	District
Satish Kumar aged about 35 years	27	21.05.2025	108, 3(5) of BNS	GRP BATHINDA	Government RLY Police Bathinda

Note: Section 75 of BNS added vide subsequent order dated 07.11.2025 passed in CRM-43768-2025.

2. On 21.08.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that allegation of molestation to the wife of the deceased. Sonu Yadav, is baseless and unsupported. Admittedly, neither such allegation has been recorded during the video call, nor, any suicide note has been left by the deceased indicating such a cause. Even if the allegations of asking the deceased to vacate the quarter is taken to be correct, such a fact alone would not



amount to instigation by the accused, immediately prior to the commission of suicide.

3. *Further, it is submitted that deceased was involved in gambling activities, with evidence of substantial money transactions amounting to lakhs of rupees in the bank accounts of his wife, Anu Aadav, and his real brother, Monu Yadav. Counsel for the petitioner Submits that the deceased may have been mentally disturbed due to losses sustained in gambling, which likely led to his decision to commit suicide.*

Therefore, the responsibility for the deceased's death cannot be attributed to the petitioner. Moreover, there is nothing recoverable from the possession of the petitioner, he is willing to ready to join the investigation and to cooperate fully, provided he is granted protection from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, 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.

6. *Adjourned to 29.10.2025.*

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

8. *Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an*



affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

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

4. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 21.08.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Jasvir Singh confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 30.08.2025 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Since, petitioner 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 petition is allowed.

However, petitioner 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.

12.11.2025
sonia

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**