

2026:PHHC:087411



219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32801-2026
DECIDED ON: 12.06.2026

SAJAN

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 128 dated 30.4.2026 U/s 110,115 and 351(2), BNS (308, 323 and 506 IPC) registered at Police Station: City Jagadhri Distt. Yamuna Nagar.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the complainant folds animosity against the petitioner because the wife of the complainant and petitioner were involved prior to marriage. He further submits that there is unexplained delay of 7 days in lodging the FIR as the alleged incident took place on 23.04.2026 and FIR was

registered on 30.04.2026. It is further argued that the complainant has received simple injuries only and that too on non-vital parts, thus no offence under Sections 308 of IPC/110 BNS is made out. He undertakes on behalf of the petitioner that he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

On behalf of the State/complainant

Learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as he is involved in other cases. However, he could not put forth any incriminating material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact that there is unexplained delay of 7 days in lodging the FIR and no injuries have been declared as grievous in nature and State could not produce any incriminating material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

As far as the contention of learned State counsel with regard to the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as ***“Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab”*** decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the

rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial the concession of bail.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

12.06.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No