



CRM-M-51517-2025

-1-

204 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51517-2025

Date of decision: 14.11.2025

VIKASH KUMAR AND ORS.

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH
AND ORS.

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vivek Kathuria, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. PP, for U.T, Chandigarh.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.072 dated 20.06.2025, under Sections 190/191(2)/191(3)/324(5)/303(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Maloya, Chandigarh.

2. Vide order dated 15.09.2025, while granting interim protection, the petitioners were directed to join investigation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that pursuant to order dated 15.09.2025, petitioners No.1 and 2 have joined the investigation and as such their interim bail may be made absolute. He further submits that despite his best efforts, he could not contact petitioner No.3.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Baldev Singh, affirmed the fact that petitioner No.3 has not joined the investigation, despite repeatedly requests, whereas petitioners No.1 and 2 have joined the investigation and they are no more required for further investigation.

**CRM-M-51517-2025****-2-**

is apparent that petitioner No.3 was granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 15.09.2025, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023. As submitted by learned State counsel that petitioner No.3 did not join the investigation in pursuance to the order dated 15.09.2025 passed by this Court. This Court had granted another opportunity to the petitioner to join the investigation on 07.11.2025 at 11.00 A.M vide order dated 04.11.2025. However, when the case came up for hearing on instruction, it was contended by learned State counsel that despite granting another opportunity, petitioner No.3 did not join the investigation. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, could not give a satisfactory explanation regarding the non-compliance of the order passed by this Court.

6. Needless to say that the case in hand is the petition for grant of anticipatory bail, which is an extra ordinary remedy. Conduct of petitioner No.3 is self speaking as despite having been granted opportunities, he has not complied with the terms and conditions of the interim anticipatory bail granted to him, by this Court. Thus, this Court is of the opinion that petitioner No.3 does not deserve to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby dismissed qua petitioner No.3.

7. In view of the above, interim order dated 15.09.2025 is made absolute qua petitioners No.1 and 2, subject to compliance of conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

8. Petition stands allowed.

14.11.2025

*renubala***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No