



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

106

CRM-M No.63621 of 2025
Date of decision: 12.11.2025

Anjali ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Munish Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
201	19.08.2025	City Ratia, District Fatehabad	305(1) and 331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Naresh Kumar posted as JE in Sub Division, DHBVNL, Ratia alleging that on the evening of 05.08.2025, he

2025:PHHC:156772



had left his office after putting a lock on the same and after checking the stock of electricity meters lying therein. In the next morning, he found the several meters old as well as new to be stolen. The window pane of the office was broken by someone while committing theft. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the accused Kamla and Sarifa Devi were arrested. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime and also took the name of the present petitioner. It was also disclosed by them that stolen meters and the other articles were given by them to the present petitioner. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. Apprehending her arrest, she filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad vide order dated 06.11.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. The co-accused have already been extended benefit of regular bail. No recovery is to be effected from her. She is ready to join the investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. As such, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted by him that

2025:PHHC:156772



there are specific allegations against the petitioner. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter and for effecting recovery of the stolen articles, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. No extraordinary and exceptional circumstance for grant of pre arrest bail has been made out in favour of the petitioner. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have committed theft of electricity meters from the office of DHBVNL. Recovery of the meters is to be effected from her. For the purpose of conducting deeper probe, her custodial interrogation is must. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. The custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. The powers of anticipatory bail are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.



7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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