



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

**CRM-M-27213-2026
Date of decision: 14.05.2026**

SURESH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483(3) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 16.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) in FIR No.108 dated 05.06.2025 registered under Sections 108 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station Hassanpur, District Palwal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner moved an application for filing fresh status report before the trial Court, which was filed in the trial Court on 04.04.2026. As per the report, the mobile, which was used in the crime was not recovered by the police, which is necessary for just and proper investigation of the present case. In this regard, the petitioner has moved complaints to Superintendent of Police, Palwal and Director



General of Police, Haryana, which are annexed with the present petition as Annexures P-6 and P-7 respectively.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana, present in the Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State. On a Court query posed to him as to whether the custody of the respondent No.2 is required for investigation purpose, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Kavita, replied in negative and submitted that the investigation is going on and there is no such application moved by the petitioner.

5. Given the nature of order this Court proposes to pass, no notice is required to be issued to respondent No.2.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner and the submissions made by learned State counsel, it transpires that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and co-operated with the investigating agency and his custody is not required by the police at this stage. As such, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed accordingly.

May 14, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No