



CRM-M-59859-2025

1

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

229

CRM-M-59859-2025

Decided on: 20.11.2025

Kuldeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rahul Sangwan, Advocate for
Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed, under section 482 B.N.S.S., 2023 (Equivalent to Section 438 Cr. P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case registered, vide FIR No.247 dated 12.08.2025 under Sections 316(4) and 61(2), of BNS 2023, at Police Station Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

2. On 22.10.2025, following order was passed:-

“Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 247 dated 12.08.2025 under Sections 316(4) and 61(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Sadar Jhajjar, District Jhajjar. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

As per allegations, four employees namely Parveen, Sankit, Dinesh and Sachin of the Company FM India Supply Chan Pvt. Ltd. were found involved in taking out scrap material from the company, which they sold to Manoj Gupta, resident of Bilaspur Gurugram. It is alleged that due to the embezzlement, the company suffered huge losses.

It is submitted that petitioner was working as Assistant Manager in the FM India Supply Chain Pvt. Ltd. and he was



the person who informed the Senior Manager regarding the offence, consequent to which the case was got registered. Learned counsel further argues that petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name figured for the first time in disclosure statement of co-accused. It is submitted that the petitioner who was, in fact the whistle blower, was being falsely involved by the co-accused on that account. Even after registration of FIR, petitioner had been regularly attending office. He further submits that as per disclosure statement of co-accused, a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- was paid to the petitioner, which the police sought to recover. Petitioner, who had clean antecedents, was ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana, who is present in the Court accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and seeks some time to file the status report.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. Petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

List again on 20.11.2025.

Status report in the matter be filed on the date fixed.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends in compliance with the order dated 22.10.2025 passed by the Court, petitioner has joined the investigation and has extended full cooperation. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

**CRM-M-59859-2025****3**

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining investigation on 19.11.2025 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 22.10.2025, passed by the 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.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.11.2025
ankit

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO