

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026 PHHC:044263



(102) CRM-M-53004-2024 (O&M)
Decided on: 20.03.2026
Uploaded on: 20.03.2026

Satpal Singh and others
.....Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana
.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner (s).
Ms. Mahima Yashpal Singla, Senior DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Ajay Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in case bearing FIR No.513 dated 30.08.2023 under Sections 420 of IPC 1860 and Section 419, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal.
2. The proceedings stand abated qua petitioner No.1—Satpal Singh, as recorded in order dated 20.02.2025.
3. As regards the other petitioners, the following order was passed on 23.10.2024:

“Notice of motion for 20.02.2025.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioners be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall

join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

At this stage, Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed power of attorney. The same is taken on record.”

4. The mediation proceedings were initiated between the rival private parties, but the same did not fructify.

5. Learned State counsel (on instructions from SI Mahesh) has submitted that the petitioners No.2 & 3 have joined investigation but their custodial interrogation is required for disclosing the whereabouts/details of other persons involved in the alleged crime.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners No.2 & 3 by arguing that allegations raised against the said petitioners are serious in nature and in case the petitioners are extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that they may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the factum of the petitioners No.2 & 3 having joined investigation & cooperated therein and their custodial interrogation being sought for disclosing the whereabouts/details of other persons involved in the alleged crime; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 23.10.2024.

8. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be

confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

9. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

10. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

20.03.2026

Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No