

2026:PHHC:044385



IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

108-1 CRM-M-67180-2025
RAVI PRAKASH PAL ... Petitioner

STATE OF HARYANA VERSUS ... Respondent

108-2 CRM-M-68162-2025
VIKAS PAL ... Petitioner

STATE OF HARYANA VERSUS ... Respondent

108-3 CRM-M-68165-2025
PRASOON PAL @ PRASUN PAL ... Petitioner

STATE OF HARYANA VERSUS ... Respondent

A N D

108-4 CRM-M-68180-2025
Date of Decision: 20.03.2026
SAURABH MISHRA @ SHORAB MISHRA ... Petitioner

STATE OF HARYANA VERSUS ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Varinder Saini, Advocate for the
petitioner(s).
Dr. (Ms.) Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Mohit Khatkar, Advocate for
Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for
the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

All abovementioned four petitions are being decided by this Common order as all of them arise out of the same FIR.

2. The petitioners have filed the abovementioned petitions under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in a case bearing FIR No.239 dated 15.07.2025 under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC registered at Police Station City Jind, District Jind.

3. Vide order dated 29.11.2025 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-67180-2025, the petitioner therein was directed to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and in the event of his arrest, he was ordered to be released on interim bail subject to furnishing personal bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. Similar reliefs were also granted to the remaining petitioners in consonance with the order dated 29.11.2025 vide orders dated 03.12.2025.

4. On the last date of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the petitioners and today also, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has sought an adjournment on the ground that the learned arguing counsel is not available.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel informs that notices were issued to the petitioners on 29.01.2026 and 16.02.2026 asking them to join the investigation, apart from that, telephonic messages were also sent to them on 11.03.2026 and 13.03.2026, but none of the petitioners came present to join the investigation.

6. From the above, it is apparently clear that the petitioners are deliberately and intentionally not joining the investigation despite being given opportunities through numerous notices/telephonic messages.

7. In light of the above and seeing the conduct of the petitioners, this Court does not find any ground to grant the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to them. Hence, all the petitions are hereby dismissed. Interim orders granted in favour of the petitioners also stand vacated.

MARCH 20, 2026.

Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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