



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M No.48142 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :11.11.2025

Rakesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Jeevanjot S. Kang, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Wazir Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This is petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, in a case arising out of FIR No.295 dated 15.07.2023 under Sections 120-B, 406, 419, 420, 506 IPC [Sections 467, 468, 471 and 201 IPC added later], Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

2. Vide order dated 29.08.2025, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer.

3. On behalf of respondent-State, learned State Counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Nilokheri, Karnal. The same be taken on record.

4. It has been submitted by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with above mentioned order, dated 29.08.2025, the petitioner has already joined investigation, and pursuant to completion of



investigation even the supplementary challan has been filed with regard to additional sections invoked in this case.

5. The above mentioned contention of learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has been duly affirmed by the learned State counsel. However, the learned State counsel vis-a-vis learned counsel for the complainant are opposing the above mentioned submission on the ground that the petitioner has not been co-operating during the course of investigation.

6. Heard.

7. However, taking into consideration the fact that investigation is already complete and the petitioner has joined investigation and other wise also the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate, it is hereby held that this plea of learned State counsel is not convincing that the custody of the petitioner is required for further investigation of the present case.

8. In view of above, the order dated 29.08.2025, whereby interim anticipatory bail was accorded to the petitioner, is hereby made absolute.

9. Present petition stands allowed, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

11.11.2025
Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No