

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:073249



(208)

CRM-M-16179-2026
Decided on: 11.05.2026
Uploaded on: 11.05.2026

Mahesh Kumar Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ankur Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Anjali Chaudhary, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending his arrest in FIR No. 26 dated 03.03.2026 (Annexure P-1) Under Section 318(4) 336(2) 336(3) 340(2) 3(5) of BNS (earlier Sections 420, 465, 468, 471 & 34 of IPC) and Section 24 of Emigration Act, registered at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. On 07.04.2026, the following order was passed:

“Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Varinder Singh Khosa, PPS, DSP, Dakha, District

Ludhiana (Rural) in Court today. The same be kept on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Inter alia, contends that the matter has been compromised between the rival concerned parties & the petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.

Put up on 11.5.2026.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 10.4.2026 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

3.1. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation, the petition is allowed and the order dated 07.04.2026 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby

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.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

11.05.2026

Naveen

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No