



CRM-M-46049-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-46049-2025
Decided on: 19.11.2025

Ronak

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Mohan Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.195 dated 10.06.2025, under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 287, 351(2), 109(1), 238 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act at PS Sadar Jind, District Jind.

2. On 22.08.2025, following order was passed:

“(i) Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), 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:

<i>Name of Petitioner(s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Ronak, aged about 18 years</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>10.06.2025</i>	<i>191(2), 191(3), 287, 351(2), 109(1), 238 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act</i>	<i>Sadar Jind</i>	<i>Jind</i>



- (ii) *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that incident in question arose due to a dispute between two groups involved in the business of wine. One group is led by the complainant/injured Surendra (S/o Raghbir), along with Sumesh @ Kala, Narender @ Bachi, and Anil @ Midha. The second group is led by the accused Sahil (S/o Surender), Vishal, and Shivam. With the passage of time, disputes escalated between the members of both groups, ultimately resulting in a verbal altercation and firing of gunshots at the time of the incident. In the course of this incident, Surendra sustained six injuries, two of which were firearm-related, evidenced by both entry and exit wounds (2+2), and the remaining injuries Nos.5 and 6 were contusions located near the firearm wounds.*
- (iii) *It is further submitted that petitioner, Ronak, aged 18 years, is not named as an accused in the FIR. His name surfaced later, in the disclosure statements made by the already-arrested accused Vishal and Shivam, who claimed that petitioner was sitting inside the car at the time the incident. Counsel for the petitioner argues that the prosecution has yet to establish any common intention on the part of the petitioner to participate in or contribute to the commission of the offence. Moreover, petitioner is a young boy and ready to join the investigation, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*
- (iv) *Notice of motion.*
- (v) *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, State, and Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent 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) *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.).*

(viii) *Besides, it is directed that petitioner 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 passport. It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court."*

**CRM-M-46049-2025**

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance to the order dated 22.08.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation on 17.09.2025.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report in the Court today. The same is taken on record. He on instructions from ASI Reena, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 17.09.2025 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 22.08.2025 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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.11.2025

reena

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO