



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-61154-2024

Date of decision: 06.05.2025

Dinesh

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Abhinav Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.0441 dated 30.09.2022 under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Model Town, District Panipat.

2. On 05.12.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had issued notice of motion to the State:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1 was registered way back on 30.09.2022 for offences under Sections 406, 420 and 506 IPC. It has been submitted that a perusal of the allegations outlined in the FIR reveal that other than being named in the FIR in question, there is no attribution qua the petitioner much less of having received any amount from the complainant or even having signed any document.”



CRM-M-61154-2024

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 28.01.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by learned State counsel, the petitioner had been granted the concession of interim bail and asked to join investigation:-

“Learned State counsel has not disputed that it is the wife of the petitioner who is the prime accused in the present case and who has allegedly duped the complainant party of their money (Rs.64 lacs) on the pretext of providing government employment to different members of the complainant’s family.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 28.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 28.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

06.05.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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