



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-71790-2025

JASBIR SINGH ALIAS JASVIR SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 18.02.2026

Date of uploading: 18.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Jatin, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 229 dated 27.06.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(3), 115(2), 351(2), 324(4) of BNS, 2023, (Section 249 and 109 of BNS, 2023 added later on) at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. On 19.12.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.229 dated 27.06.2025 registered at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad, Haryana under Sections 190, 191(3), 115(2), 351(2), 324(4) of BNS, 2023, (Section 249 and 109 of BNS, 2023 added later on).

Notice of motion.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG Haryana, has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record. The



parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated and it is the opposite party who was the aggressor and the present petitioner had also got registered one FIR No.232 dated 30.06.2025 under Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 324(4), 351(2) of BNS, Police Station Dabua, against the present complainant for causing injuries to him. Learned counsel further contended that the injury which has been declared dangerous to life is not attributed to the petitioner and the same is attributed to co-ccused Ajay and Gajinder.

Now, the matter has been compromised between the parties vide Annexure-P2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is ready to join the investigation and he shall abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and he may be released on anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail on account of gravity of the offence. However, learned counsel for the complainant has admitted the factum of compromise having been entered into between the parties and he further stated that he has no objection in case anticipatory bail is granted to petitioner. Adjourned to 18.02.2026 for filing status report.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 19.12.2025 the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/serious in nature and hence he ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail. He has further iterated that in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the investigation/witnesses.



5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and is no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 19.12.2025 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.
6. Ordered accordingly.
7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

18.02.2026
jatin

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