



CRM-M-70343-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

114

CRM-M-70343-2025
Decided on: 17.03.2026

Ravi Rahul
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, 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
Ravi Rahul aged about 40 years	355	20.11.2025	232 and 351(3) of BNS	Sector 27	Sonipat

2. On 12.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“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
Ravi Rahul aged about 40 years	355	20.11.2025	232 and 351(3) of	Sector 27	Sonipat



			BNS		
--	--	--	-----	--	--

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that FIR No.802 dated 17.10.2025 under Section 3(1)(r) of the SC/ST Act was registered at the instance of petitioner – Ravi Rahul, against one Vishnu Sharan Gupta at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat. In retaliation, Vishnu Sharan Gupta (accused in FIR No.802 dated 17.10.2025) got another FIR registered against the petitioner, i.e. FIR No.332 dated 29.10.2025 under Sections 211, 389, 406, 420, and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sector 27, District Sonapat. In that case, petitioner-Ravi Rahul, was granted the concession of bail, vide order dated 12.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat.*

Thereafter, complainant – Vishnu Sharan, once again lodged another FIR against the petitioner, i.e. FIR No.355 dated 20.11.2025 at Police Station Sector 27, District Sonapat, under Sections 232 and 351(3) of BNS, which is impugned FIR herein. In the present FIR, allegation levelled against the petitioner is that he threatened the complainant to withdraw FIR No.332 dated 29.10.2025, which was filed by the complainant against the petitioner.

3. *Counsel for the petitioner submits that, on the basis of these allegations, an application filed by the complainant seeking cancellation of the bail earlier granted to the petitioner, was allowed, vide order dated 29.11.2025 (Annexure P-5). However, petitioner has also challenged the said order dated 29.11.2025 before this Court by filing CRM-M-70354- 2025.*

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *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.*

6. *This Court has examined the allegations mentioned in the present FIR. Even if the allegations are presumed to be correct, custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be that necessary, as the alleged threat was conveyed through a telephonic call made by the petitioner to complainant-Vishnu*



CRM-M-70343-2025

3

Sharan Gupta. The relevant call details can be obtained by the investigating officer through the CDR, along with location of the mobile phone at the time of the alleged call.

Besides this, it is evident that the parties are at loggerheads and have a history of filing criminal cases against each other. Still, it is for the investigating agency to determine, whether the allegation is true, or false.

However, for the purpose of custodial interrogation of the petitioner, State is required to furnish sound reasons justifying such need; keeping in view the law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar, 2014 AIR (SCW) 3930, Law Finder Doc ID #572180.

7. *List again on 22.01.2026.*

8. *Meanwhile, 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.).*

9. *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 submits that in compliance with the order dated 12.12.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation and has extended full cooperation. He, therefore, prays for confirmation of the interim anticipatory bail order.

**CRM-M-70343-2025****4**

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of an affidavit of Rajpal, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Crime, Sonipat, in Court today. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kuldeep, and referring to paragraph No. 8 of the status report, submits that in pursuance of the directions issued by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation on 07.01.2026; however, he has not cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

6. Although petitioner has joined the investigation, it is noticed that he has not fully cooperated with the investigating agency. Nonetheless, considering the facts of the case, the nature of the alleged offence, and the principles of law governing bail, this Court is of the view that the ad-interim bail order dated 12.12.2025 ought to be made absolute

It is made clear that 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. However, it is clarified that in case the passport or an affidavit regarding non-possession of a passport, if he does not possess one, is not submitted to the Investigating Agency or the Court concerned within a period of two weeks from today, the present order shall be



CRM-M-70343-2025

5

deemed to be inoperative and the Investigating Officer shall be at liberty to proceed with the arrest of the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.03.2026
Rashmi

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