



101

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

CRM-M-66132-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.11.2025

REENA RANA**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Davinder Lubana Advocate
for petitioner (through VC).

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. The petition under Section 483(3) read with Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeks cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 30.09.2020 of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR No.87 dated 01.07.2014 under Sections 323, 406, 420, 294, 354, 498-A, 506 and 120-B Indian Penal Code, Police Station Raipur Rani, District Panchkula was got registered by the petitioner against her husband Kuldeep Singh and respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 was declared a proclaimed offender. He filed an application for anticipatory bail before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula and secured interim order dated 17.09.2020 vide which he was directed to join the proceedings and file an affidavit containing the address, mobile/telephone number, passport number and email IDs of co-

accused and handover the passport to the Investigating Officer. Respondent No.2 did not comply with the order. Yet, the order of interim anticipatory bail was made absolute. Thus, the order of anticipatory bail dated 30.09.2020 of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula deserved to be cancelled.

3. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner that the anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 on 30.09.2020 deserved to be cancelled on account of violation of condition, is devoid of merit.

4. Anticipatory bail once granted, requires cogent, strong and compelling reasons for cancellation. In **Dolat Ram and Others Vs. State of Haryana, (1995) 1 SCC 349**, Hon'ble Apex Court has ruled that rejection of bail in a non-bailable case at the initial stage and cancellation of bail so granted have to be considered and dealt on different basis. Very cogent and overwhelming circumstances are required for an order directing cancellation of bail, already granted. Generally speaking, grounds of cancellation of bail, broadly are interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice or evasion or attempt to evade due course of justice or abuse of the concession granted to the accused in any manner. The satisfaction of the Court, on the basis of material placed on record and possibility of the accused absconding is yet another reason justifying the cancellation of bail. However, bail once granted cannot be cancelled in a mechanical manner without considering whether any supervening circumstances have rendered it no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom by enjoying the concession of bail during the trial.

5. Respondent No.2 filed an application for anticipatory bail on

17.09.2020. At the time of hearing, his counsel submitted that if he was allowed to join proceedings, he would file an affidavit containing the address, mobile/telephone number, passport numbers and email IDs of co-accused Sandeep, Renu and Kuldeep and would handover his passport to the Investigating Officer. Considering the fact that three accused had already been acquitted on 15.11.2019 and his relationship with the complainant, respondent No.2 was allowed interim bail, was directed to join investigation, to cooperate with the Investigating Agency. He was also bound by the statement of his counsel regarding disclosing the details of other co-accused and surrendering of his passport.

6. On the next date of hearing, when the Investigating Agency conveyed to the Court that passport numbers of co-accused had been disclosed, considering the fact that respondent No.2 had joined investigation, interim order dated 17.09.2020 was made absolute and the petition was allowed.

7. An application for cancellation of bail was moved before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula, which was dismissed on 16.12.2024 for the reason that the Court of then learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula had, in its discretion, made the interim order of anticipatory bail absolute and there was no reason to believe that respondent No.2 had concealed facts from the Court. No ground was found to cancel the anticipatory bail and the application was declined.

8. Once the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula made absolute the order of interim anticipatory bail dated 17.09.2020 considering that respondent No.2 had joined investigation and disclosed the passport numbers etc., learned Additional Sessions Judge,

Panchkula, vide order dated 16.12.2024 correctly reasoned that he was not sitting in appeal against the order dated 30.09.2020. Exercise of discretion by learned Additional Sessions Judge, appears to be on a sound basis and there is no ground to interfere. There is no cogent ground or supervening circumstance to cancel the order of anticipatory bail. This apart, cancellation of bail has not been sought by Investigating Agency in this case. Apparently, the Investigating Agency was able to carry out effective investigation despite the order of anticipatory bail dated 30.09.2020.

9. The petition for cancellation of anticipatory bail has no merit is hereby dismissed.

10. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

26.11.2025

Sumit Singla

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

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