



CRM-M-37646-2025

1

106

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

CRM-M-37646-2025

DECIDED ON: 20.03.2026

SUNIL KUMAR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Govind Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate, and
Mr. Jaswant Singh Advocate, for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.192, dated 10.06.2025, under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 3(5) of BNS and section 24 of Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 17.07.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as the allegations against him are vague and bald. It is submitted that there is no transaction involving the alleged amount with the present petitioner, nor has any amount been received by the petitioner, either in cash or through any bank transaction. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, accordingly, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.



On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Haryana puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State. He seeks some time to file reply.

4. Learned State counsel is directed to file status report explaining therein the allegations and evidence against the petitioner.

5. Adjourned to 21.08.2025.

6. Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondent/State.”

3. During the course of hearing, learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant were unable to point out any transaction made by the complainant with the petitioner through cheque or online transfer, nor they could establish that *prima facie* allegations were credible.

4. However, counsel for the complainant submits that in paragraph No.22 of the present petition, petitioner had disclosed the pendency of one criminal case registered against him, i.e. FIR No. 94 of 2022 under Sections 420, 406, 506, and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal. It was further contended that another case is also registered against the petitioner, i.e., FIR No. 0729 dated 15.09.2022 under Sections 420 and 406 of the IPC and Section 24 of the Emigration Act, which has not been disclosed. Thus, it was argued that there has been concealment of material facts and, therefore, present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in both the aforesaid cases, petitioner has already been granted bail. It was contended that no adverse inference should be drawn against the petitioner for non-disclosure of the second FIR. It was further submitted



CRM-M-37646-2025

3

that omission to mention FIR No.0729 dated 15.09.2022 was inadvertent, and petitioner regrets the same, assuring that such an omission will not be repeated in future.

6. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available on file.

7. Admittedly, no amount has been found credited in the bank account of the petitioner. **Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition**, by directing the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. With the direction issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.03.2026

Lavisha

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether reportable *Yes/No*