



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

CRM-M-25704-2025
Decided on: 09.03.2026

RAVI KUMAR ALIAS RAVI
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate, for
Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ravi Kumar alias Ravi, aged about 29 years	03	03.01.2025	331(4) and 305-A of BNS	Bikhiwind	Tarn Taran

2. On 08.07.2025, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR (supra) at the behest of SHO of concerned Police Station. The petitioner was detained by the police official on 03.01.2025 at 02:30 PM in connection with the complaint made by one Tajinder Singh with regard to theft of his German Shepherd Dog. The petitioner has approached this Court by filing a criminal writ petition i.e. CRWP No.519 of 2025, seeking a relief against the police official for his



illegal confinement and regarding the injuries as recorded in medico legal report attached as Annexure P-1 with the aforesaid writ petition. The petitioner was not named in the FIR and the complainant as per the CCTV footage alleged that three persons have committed the theft with muffled faces. Thereafter, on 21.01.2025, at the behest of the police officials, the petitioner has been nominated as one of the accused as per the supplementary statement and five persons have been nominated as an accused and it is not forthcoming in the supplementary statement regarding the source of the complainant's knowledge about the identity of the thieves. The petitioner is having clean antecedents and is not involved in any other case.

Adjourned to 11.08.2025.

*In the meantime, keeping in view the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833**, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer within two weeks from today and on doing so or in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.*

If the Investigating/Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Investigating/Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court."

3. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 08.07.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation on



02.08.2025, 19.08.2025, 15.09.2025, 16.09.2025, 14.10.2025, and nothing has been recovered from his possession. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while referring to the status report dated 05.07.2025, which is already appended with the present petition, submits that complainant got recorded his supplementary statement on 21.01.2025, wherein he stated that upon viewing the CCTV footage, he suspected that the accused namely Harpreet Singh alias Happy, Harpal Singh alias Bhola, Husanpreet Singh alias Husan, and Ravi Kumar (petitioner herein) were involved in the theft in question.

5. Learned State counsel further submits that when co-accused Husanpreet Singh alias Husan was interrogated, he made a disclosure statement to the effect that he, Harpreet Singh, Harpal Singh and Ravi Kumar (petitioner herein) are friends and on 03.01.2025, in connivance with each other, they committed theft at the shop of Rajbir Jewellers. It is further stated that petitioner had conducted *rekki*, prior to the commission of the theft. After committing the theft, stolen items were allegedly taken to the house of co-accused Harpal Singh, and thereafter, petitioner – Ravi Kumar took the said stolen articles to his own house.

On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, learned State counsel submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for the purpose of recovery of the stolen articles.

6. It is further submitted that although, petitioner has joined the investigation on the dates mentioned by learned counsel for the



petitioner, but he is not cooperating with the investigation and is allegedly giving misleading responses.

7. However, on asking by the Court, learned State counsel could not point out any specific investigation conducted with regard to the verification of the alleged stolen articles/gold jewellery which was lying in the shop, or any supporting evidence in that regard. Nevertheless, learned State counsel places strong reliance upon the disclosure statement made by co-accused Husanpreet Singh alias Husan.

8. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

9. Admittedly, no investigation has been conducted with regard to the verification of the alleged stolen articles/gold jewellery which was lying in the shop, or the supporting evidence in that regard. However, the same may be a matter of evidence to be led before learned trial Court at the appropriate stage.

10. This Court also has serious reservations as to whether the disclosure statement allegedly made by the co-accused would be admissible in evidence, in accordance with law. At present, primary basis for the alleged involvement of the petitioner appears to be the supplementary statement of the complainant, which was recorded 17–18 days after the incident, wherein petitioner and other co-accused were named.

11. Since petitioner has already joined the investigation, this Court does not find any substantial reason to deny him the concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, ad-interim bail order dated 08.07.2025,



CRM-M-25704-2025

5

passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute. **Consequently, present petition is allowed.**

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

12. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**