



CRM-M-33016-2025

- 1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

214

**CRM-M-33016-2025  
Date of decision: 11.09.2025**

SANDEEP @ PITTAR

....Petitioner

**Versus**

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

**SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)**

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
Sandeep @ Pittar, aged 27 years	112	26.04.2025	115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Kasola	Rewari

2. On 23.06.2025, 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
Sandeep @ Pittar, aged 27 years	112	26.04.2025	115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Kasola	Rewari



2. *As per the allegations, on 23.04.2025, complainant-Satyam Shukla, while coming from ITI and going to his house, was intercepted by the petitioner and his other two co-accused namely Mundi and Rohit. Forcibly, on the gun point, he was made to sit quietly on the bike of Mundi and was taken to some other place where beatings were given with sticks and iron rods. A silver chain was snatched and Rs.100/- was taken out from his pocket. Petitioner forced the complainant to touch Rohit's feet and to apologize while giving beatings to him. It is also alleged that they also threatened that if the complainant appears in front of them again, they will shoot them being resident of U.P.*

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no serious injury has been specifically attributed to the petitioner. It is further contended that, at the most, petitioner could be alleged to have caused grievous injury, i.e. fracture, which is a bailable offence under the law.*

4. *Counsel also points out that during the course of investigation, allegations regarding the snatching of a silver chain and the extortion of Rs.100 at gunpoint have been found to be false, therefore, no weapon or stolen article is to be recovered from the petitioner. Moreover, petitioner is willing to cooperate with the investigation and is ready to join the same, provided he is granted protection from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

7. *Adjourned to 11.09.2025.*

8. *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.).*

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.*

10. *However, it is clarified that in case, petitioner misuses the concession of bail, it would be open for the complainant/injured/prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail order passed by this Court.”*

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from the official respondent confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 25.07.2025 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 23.06.2025, 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.

6. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**11.09.2025**  
**amandeep**

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No