



CRM-M-60341-2025 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-60341-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:08.12.2025

Rahul @ Rahul Yadav

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Sourabh Sheoran, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. On 29.10.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that name of the petitioner surfaced on the disclosure statement of co-accused, Trilok Chand, who is in custody. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon’ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, 2021(1) RCR (CrI.) 1. He alleges false implication on the ground that while the petitioner was in custody alongwith the said co-accused, there was a scuffle between them and even there is no call detail between them. The petitioner has not been ever involved in the case under the NDPS Act. He is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency and will cooperate.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. B.S.Saroha, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

**CRM-M-60341-2025 (O&M) 2**

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation on or before 11.11.2025. In the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, subject to compliance of conditions as enshrined under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

However, it is clarified that if the petitioner does not join and cooperate with the Investigating Agency as required by the Arresting/Investigating Officer, this interim order shall be deemed to have been vacated.

Adjourned to 08.12.2025.”

2. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 29.10.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. (now 482(2) of BNSS, 2023)

CRM-M-60341-2025 (O&M) 3

5. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

December 08, 2025
dinesh

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