

2026:PHHC:065821



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

102+204 (2)

CRM-M-11163-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 29.04.2026

VINEET @ VINEET KUMAR

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Balvinder Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana

SURYA PARTAP SINGH. J.(Oral)

CRM-18440-2026

This is an application seeking for placing on record order dated 09.02.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Criminal Appeal No.767 of 2026. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is hereby allowed and the order dated 09.02.2026 annexed with the application is taken on record.

Main case

1. This petition for pre-arrest 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.554 dated 18.10.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 108(2), 3(5), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Sector-58, District Faridabad.

2. Vide order dated 26.02.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 26.02.2026, the petitioner has joined the investigation. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the similar benefit has been accorded to co-accused namely 'Sanjay Sharma', by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Sanjay Sharma vs. State of Haryana' Criminal Appeal No.767 of 2026.

4. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 26.02.2026 be made absolute.

5. The learned State Counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel since certain documents, with the assistance of petitioner, are yet to be recovered, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. In the case of 'Sanjay Sharma vs. State of Haryana', the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed as under;-

“Collection of evidence in course of investigation is the responsibility of the investigating officer. An accused, in

course of investigation, cannot be completed to self-incriminate himself”.

8. In view of facts and circumstances of the case and the principles propounded by Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Sanjay Sharma’ (supra), the order dated 26.02.2026, is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
vipin

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No