



CRM-M-67199-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-67199-2025
Decided on: 18.02.2026

Tinku Hooda

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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 hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Tinku Hooda	33	08.02.2025	109(1), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act (later on added Sections 103(1), 61(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 27, 29, 30 of Arms Act	Rohtak Sadar	Rohtak

2. On 02.12.2025, following order was passed:-



“ 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 hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Tinku Hooda	33	08.02.2025	109(1), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act (later on added Sections 103(1), 61(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 27, 29, 30 of Arms Act	Rohtak Sadar	Rohtak

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the FIR. Even it is not mentioned that any other accused was armed with danda etc., except that fire shots were used by the accused persons with the pistols which they were holding.
3. Learned counsel argues that the name of the petitioner has been introduced at a much belated stage, i.e., after about 15 days of the incident, and that too after discharge of the injured, namely Saurav, from the hospital. Had there been any truth in the allegations, the supplementary statement could have been recorded immediately during the period of hospitalization of the injured, after obtaining the opinion of the Doctor. While making submissions, learned counsel also refers to the impugned order dated 11.11.2025 (P-2), whereby the plea for anticipatory bail was dismissed by the learned Trial Court on the ground that lathi/dandas used in the crime are yet to be recovered



Further submits that petitioner is ready to join investigation, if protected from arrest. Thus, he prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.-*

5. *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.*

6. *Adjourned to 18.02.2026.*

7. *In the 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 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.”

3. Though there is no one present in Court today, to represent the petitioner, learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that in compliance with the order dated 02.12.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation. It is further submitted that, as of now, custodial interrogation of petitioner is not required for the purposes of the investigation.

**CRM-M-67199-2025****4**

4. I have heard learned State counsel and perused the paper-book.

5. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 02.12.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

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.

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.

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

6. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

18.02.2026
Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**