



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

132-1

CRM-M-65118-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 23.03.2026

Harsh Kumar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and anr.

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**PRESENT:** Mr. Vijay Deep Rathree, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Nitin Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**CRM-12540-2026**

I. This is an application filed u/s 528 of BNSS, 2023, for placing on record the transcript copy of audio (Audio Transcript), as Annexure R-2/1.

II. Allowed as prayed for. Copy of audio transcript, Annexure R-2/1 filed along with application is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

III. CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-65118-2025

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-



Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Harsh Kumar, aged about 27 years	232	13.10.2025	231, 308(6), 318(4), 351(3) of BNS, 2023	Arya Nagar	Rohtak

2. In the present case, on 18.11.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, Rajnesh Kumar, son of Krishan Kumar, resident of VPO Siwana, Tehsil Beri, District Jhajjar, is hereby ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Let amended memo of parties be filed by counsel for the petitioner, in the Registry, within a period of three days from today, without moving any separate application.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia, contends, that petitioner had filed a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act against respondent No.2, Rajnesh Kumar, on account of dishonour of a cheque amounting to Rs.2,90,000/-. During the pendency of the said complaint, parties arrived at a compromise, and consequently, a compromise deed dated 16.09.2025 was placed on record by the petitioner with a request to pass an award on the basis of the said compromise.

4. Allegation now levelled against the petitioner is that certain interpolations were made in the compromise deed, whereby compromise amount was allegedly altered from Rs.2,90,000/- to Rs.4,04,000/-, resulting in registration of the present FIR against the petitioner pursuant to court orders.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations pertain solely to documentary evidence, and the truth can be ascertained only by examining the documents relied upon by both the sides. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Thus, counsel seeks concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. Notice of motion.

7. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.

8. Adjourned to 15.01.2026.

9. Let newly added respondent No.2 be served through dasti process, for the next date of hearing fixed before this Court.

10. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the



investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

11. *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.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 18.11.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 18.11.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**, accordingly.



8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 23, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No