

CRM-M-11261-2026

2026:PHHC:049027



**210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-11261-2026

Date of decision: March 30, 2026

Rashid Ali

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 297 dated 04.05.2025 under Sections 316(4)/60(b) of the BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Gurgaon Sadar, District Gurugram.

CRM-M-11261-2026

2. On 11.03.2026, following order had been passed: -

“Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.297 dated 04.05.2025 registered under Sections 316(4) and 60(b) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Gurgaon Sadar, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any concern with the theft of iron rods (Saria). He argued that the petitioner is neither owner, nor driver of the aforesaid truck and he is falsely roped on the allegation that he remains in telephonic contact with drivers of truck. He further argued that the petitioner is working as a Transport Commission Agent and arranged trucks for transportation of goods through transport companies and he used to remain in telephone contact with drivers. He further argued that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged shortage of iron bars and the same have already been recovered and now the petitioner has been falsely roped in the name of Fauji @ Sajij that too after a gap of more than 06 months from registration of the FIR. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused Sanjeev Kumar. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. Further, co-accused Sanjeev Kumar, Parveen, Sehjad and Sabbir have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court, vide orders dated 16.05.2025, 21.05.2025 and 16.07.2025, respectively. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from him.

CRM-M-11261-2026

Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, she has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

Adjourned to 30.03.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 11.03.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.
4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Anand, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.
5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 11.03.2026 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join

CRM-M-11261-2026

investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

March 30, 2026
Rts

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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