

2026:PHHC:087365



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CRM-M-33793-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 12.06.2026

SANDEEP KUMAR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. G.S.Gopera, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, {earlier u/s 438 of Cr. P.C.} for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0152, Dated 14.10.2025 under Section 406 and 420 of IPC (Section 316 {2} and Sections 318{4} of BNS} registered at Police Station-Dhand, District-Kaithal, in the interest of justice.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per FIR no offence is made out against him and the present case is civil in nature and no criminal

liability is made out. He contends that there is delay of about 4 to 5 years in lodging the FIR.

He has argued that there is no evidence that the alleged amount was received by petitioner whereas said alleged amount was deposited in the account of some other person namely Ankit to whom the present petitioner does not know.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana. accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He opposes the prayer for grant of bail stating that the petitioner along with co-accused induced the complainant with an amount of Rs. 200000/- on the assurance of securing employment for the complainant's son as Gram Sachiv.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact that the petitioner was not beneficiary to the alleged transaction which was admittedly credited to the account of one Ankit and merely on the basis of the assertion that the petitioner is close to Ankit, the petitioner cannot be roped into the present FIR.

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.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

12.06.2026
anuradha

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