



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CRM-M-64463-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 12.03.2025

RAJESH KUMAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Akshat Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. Supplementary status report dated 06.03.2025 filed in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, (HQ), Rewari, District Rewari is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Arguments heard.
3. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
407	12.12.2023	120-B, 201, 272, 273, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC; 103 and 104 Trade Marks Act, 1999; 61(1)(c) and 72-A of Punjab Excise Act, 1914	Dharuheda, Rewari



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in compliance to the order dated 18.02.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such interim bail granted to the petitioner may be confirmed.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions received from SI Krishan Kumar has intimated that the petitioner has joined investigation and is no more required for any custodial investigation in this case nor he is required for further investigation.

6. During the course of hearing on 18.02.2025, the following order was passed:-

“3. It is, inter alia, submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner was not named in the FIR and allegations against him cropped up in the second disclosure statement made by co-accused, Pawan Kumar alleging to have started transactions with the petitioner after 06.11.2023. He contends that petitioner had been supplying Flex material to him but has never indulged in any supply of fake Holograms, labels, etc. in any manner. He submits that as per the account statement (Annexure R-1), there are payments made by co-accused, Pawan Kumar to the petitioner on 23.09.2023, 24.09.2023 & 05.10.2023, totalling only Rs.13,500/- towards supply of Flex material. He submits that even otherwise, as per the version of the prosecution, the alleged supply would be ranging to more than Rs.80,00,000/- and there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has ever been paid any such amount. The petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents and has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused Pawan Kumar. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer present in Court, has referred to the account statement (Annexure R-1) to submit that the payments totalling to Rs.13,500/- have been made by co-accused Pawan Kumar to the account of the petitioner. He submits that except for the disclosure statement of co-accused Pawan Kumar, nothing substantial is there on record against the petitioner as of now. He has also not disputed the fact that the petitioner is



not having any criminal antecedents.

5. In these circumstances, without commenting on the merits, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days from today and in the event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. She shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. List on 12.03.2025.”

7. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 18.02.2025 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 18.02.2025 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
8. The petition stands allowed.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

12.03.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No