



CRM-M-66028-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211/2

CRM-M-66028-2025
Decided on: 13.01.2026

Manpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

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 FIR No.210 dated 09.11.2023, under Sections 302 and 210 of IPC at PS Boha, District Mansa.

2. On 26.11.2025, following order was passed:

“(i) Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.210, dated 09.11.2023, under Sections 302 and 210 of IPC, registered at Police Station Boha, District Mansa, as the petitioner has been summoned as additional accused, vide order dated 03.10.2025 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Mansa (Annexure P-3), in case bearing No.SC/20/2024, titled as ‘State versus Pinki Rani’.

(ii) Counsel for the petitioner submits that vide order dated 03.10.2025, petitioner has been summoned by learned trial Court, along with three other accused, namely, Rinku, Jony, and Vicky, sons of Bhura Ram, by



CRM-M-66028-2025

invoking powers under Section 319 Cr.P.C.

(iii) Learned counsel further argues that similarly situated co accused, namely Rinku Kumar, Jony, and Vicky, have already been directed by the trial Court to be released on bail, provided they appear before the Court on the date fixed (earlier scheduled for 14.11.2025). Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner would be fully satisfied, if a similar direction is passed in his favour.

(iv) Order dated 17.10.2025, in respect of the other summoned co-accused, passed in CRM-M-59195-2025, reads as under:

“Present: Mr. Rajjeet Singh Virk, Advocate

for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

- 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 petitioners, namely CRM-M-66028-2025-2 (i) Rinku Kumar, aged about 38 years; (ii) Joini Kumar, aged about 31 years; and (iii) Vikas Kumar, aged about 28 years – who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.210 dated 09.11.2023, under Sections 302 and 201 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Boha, District Mansa (Annexure P-2). The petitioners have been summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. by the trial Court as additional accused to face trial vide order dated 03.10.2025 (Annexure P-1), and they apprehend their arrest upon appearance before the trial Court in compliance with the said summons.*
- 2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that at the initial stage, all three petitioners were declared innocent at the time of filing of the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. However, subsequently, without there being any sufficient or fresh evidence, the petitioners have been summoned vide order dated 03.10.2025 to face trial as additional accused. It is further submitted that if some interim protection is granted, the petitioners are ready and*



CRM-M-66028-2025

willing to appear and join the proceedings before the learned trial Court.

3. *Notice of motion.*

4. *On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report by verifying the submissions addressed by the petitioner’s counsel.*

5. *Adjourned to 13.01.2026.*

6. *In the meanwhile, petitioners are directed to appear before trial Court on the date fixed before it, i.e. 14.11.2025. It is, however, made clear that on their appearance before trial Court on the date fixed, they shall be released on bail, subject to satisfaction of the learned trial Court.*

7. *Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their respective passports to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possesses. Otherwise, would submit their affidavits, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport. It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.”*

(v) *Notice of motion.*

(vi) *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

(vii) *Adjourned to 13.01.2026.*

To be heard along with CRM-M-59195-2025.

(viii) *Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to appear before trial Court on the date fixed before it, i.e. 05.01.2026. It is, however, made clear that on his appearance before trial Court on the date fixed, he shall be released on bail, subject to satisfaction of the learned trial Court.*

Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses.

**CRM-M-66028-2025**

Otherwise, would submit his affidavits, 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. Learned State counsel on instructions, contends that in compliance to the order dated 26.11.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 26.11.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

5. The 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.

6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport 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.

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

13.01.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:~~YES/NO~~
~~YES/NO~~