



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

212

**CRM-M No.9604 of 2026
Date of decision : 1.4.2026
Date of uploading : 1.4.2026**

Sohit @ Rohit**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Punjab**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Suvir Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner
(through VC)
Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab
Mr. Akshay Chadha, Advocate, for the complainant

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 19.2.2026, the following order was passed:

'CRM-7578 of 2026

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-9604 of 2026

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.159 dated 24.09.2025 registered under Section 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that two co-accused, namely, Payal and Mohit were arrested and have been granted the concession of regular bail and third co-accused, namely, Seema has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.11.2025, which has been confirmed vide order dated 03.02.2026 (Annexure P-2). He submits that no recovery was effected from any of the arrested co-accused. Therefore, at this stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not



be required. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and is ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file status report.

Adjourned to 1.4.2026.

In the meanwhile, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. He shall join the investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

Investigating Officer through learned State counsel is directed to inform the complainant about the pendency of this petition and file compliance report.'

2. Learned State counsel (on instructions) submits that pursuant to the order dated 19.2.2026, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that there are direct and serious allegations against the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that recovery of the money/gold articles in question has not yet been effected. Hence, the petitioner ought not to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.
4. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. Interim order dated 19.2.2026, passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.
5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be



confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

1.4.2026
Ashwani

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