



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

102

CRM-M-54692-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

Mukul @ Arman

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Rajat Singh, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG Haryana

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.408 dated 19.06.2025 registered under Sections 110, 115, 126, 190, 191(3) and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Gurgaon Sadar, District Gurugram.

2. On 25.09.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

"CRM-39149-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

MAIN CASE

Through the instant petition, the petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.408 dated 19.06.2025 registered under Sections 110, 115, 126, 190, 191(3) and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Gurgaon Sadar, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that no offence under Section 110 of BNS (erstwhile Section 308 of IPC) is made out in the present case. Even, no injury has been attributed to the petitioner nor his name is figured in the FIR; the petitioner was nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement, which is inadmissible in evidence. As per the complainant version, the petitioner was seen in CCTV footage near the spot of occurrence, however, the petitioner

has his shop nearby and use that way regularly to go to his shop. Learned counsel submitted that co-accused, namely, Ashu Saini has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2025 passed in CRM-M No.49393 of 2025 (Annexure P-4) and requested for relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Upon advance notice, learned State counsel appears on behalf of respondent-State and submits that the petitioner was armed with danda and caused injuries to the complainant, who later on, also identified the petitioner.

Mr. Vinod Gupta, Advocate with Mr. Didar Singh, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his power of attorney. The same is taken on record. Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the prayer made by the petitioner and submitted that the complainant received serious injuries as he was beaten up by the petitioner along with other accused with an iron rod and danda, and received 16 stitches on his head. Further, the petitioner was seen in CCTV footage also and prayed for dismissal of the instant petition.

Heard.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the main injury is attributed to the co-accused, who has already been released on regular bail by the trial Court; another co-accused, namely, Ashu Saini has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 04.09.2025; and the main injury under Section 110 of BNS is not attributed to the petitioner, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required by Investigating Officer. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of investigating/arresting officer subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.), till the next date of hearing.

To be heard along with CRM-M No.49393 of 2025 i.e. on 18.11.2025.”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Dharmender affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is

not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 25.09.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

17.03.2026

M.Kamra

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