

CRM-M-52933-2024

-1-

2025.PHHC:071969



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

287 (1)

CRM-M-52933-2024

Date of Decision: 26.05.2025

SANDEEP KUMAR

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Singh Saini, Advocate
for the complainant.

Mr. Davinder Kumar, Advocate
for the victim/injured.

N. S. SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.275, dated 05.10.2024, under Section 115(2), 351(3), 109(1), 3(5) & 117(2) (added later) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Chhachhrauli, District Yamuna Nagar (Annexure P-1).



2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 24.10.2024, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant has concealed the material facts and the genesis of the occurrence in the present case. In fact, the complainant, his father and Raj Kumar son of Surta Ram had beaten up the petitioner and had set the tractor of the petitioner on fire. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the video (Annexure P-3) in this regard. Learned counsel further submits that even at the time of burning of the tractor, some police officials were present at the spot and the police had taken the tractor in its possession. Still the said fact was not mentioned in any of the reports submitted before the trial Court. He further submits that even the grievous injury suffered by Raj Kumar was on non-vital part of the body and a dispute relating to the partition of the land is pending between the parties, who are otherwise closely related to each other.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.

4. Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.



5. In view of the above statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the interim order dated 24.10.2024 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

26.05.2025.
vipin

(N. S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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