



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44732-2025
Date of decision: 26.09.2025

GANDHI MANDAL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG Haryana.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS"), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0016 dated 30.01.2025 under Sections 3(5) and 306 BNS, registered at Police Station DLF Phase-1, District Gurugram.

2. On 26.08.2025, following order had been passed: -

“ Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0016 dated 30.01.2025 registered under Sections 3(5) and 306 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station DLF Phase-1, District Gurugram.

Status report filed by learned State counsel, in Court today, is taken on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that as per case of the complainant, the petitioner was employed by him on 04.11.2024 as a worker through an agency. In



the intervening night of 22.01.2025, the petitioner along with her accomplices left the premises without any information after stealing the jewellery and other electronic items amounting to Rs.27,37,000/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence dated 22.01.2025 and the FIR in question was registered on 30.01.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 08 days. It has also been contended that the prosecution is strongly relying on the CCTV footage to show that the petitioner had left the house with her accomplices along with the suitcase but the present petitioner was not seen in the CCTV footage. There are no specific allegations against the petitioner and she has no criminal antecedents. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. While referring to the status report, it is argued that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner was not seen in the CCTV footage nor has been stated so in the status report filed by the State.

List on 26.09.2025.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, she shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 26.08.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from H.C. Ravish Kumar, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 26.08.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall

203
CRM-M-44732-2025

2025.PHHC.135763



-3-

continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

26.09.2025
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |