



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-7815 of 2026

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Komal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondentt.

Mr. Rao Ajender Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 192 dated 12.11.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 351(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 Police Station Rampura, District Rewari, Haryana.

2. Mr. Rao Ajender Singh, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed power of attorney. The same be taken on record.

3. Vide order dated 10.02.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the

satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

4. Heard.

5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 10.02.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 10.02.2026 be made absolute.

6. The learned State counsel, on instructions from 'SI Karan Singh', has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation, and that for further investigation of this case his custodial interrogation is not required.

7. The learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. It has been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that the weapon of offence has not been recovered in this case, and therefore, the benefit of bail should not be accorded to the petitioner. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that the complainant is still living under the fear on account of illegal & terrorising activities of the petitioner.

8. In response to above-mentioned arguments of learned counsel for the complainant, the learned State counsel has submitted that the weapon of offence has to be recovered from the possession of co-accused, namely 'Deepak, who is still at large.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. Taking into consideration the above-mentioned arguments and

the following relevant factors, it transpires that:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that the petitioner cannot be forced to assist the prosecuting agency for the recovery of incriminating material, which may harm his interests or may amount to defeating his right of defence, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the cases of "Vinay Kumar Gupta v. State of Madhya Pradesh" [Criminal Appeal No. 939 of 2026, decided on 16.02.2026] and "Sanjay Sharma v. State of Haryana" [Criminal Appeal No. 767 of 2026, decided on 09.02.2026];
- iii) that no significant evidence is to be discovered, with the assistance of petitioner, in this case, which may be helpful in linking the petitioner with the commission of crime;
- iv) that the offence for which the petitioner is being prosecuted is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate;
- v) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vi) that trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and

viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

11. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 10.02.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 30, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No