



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

CRM-M-13629-2025

Date of decision: 01.04.2025

GANESH RAM MEENA

....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Tejbir Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Jatinderpal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Status report dated 27.03.2025 in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Ferozpur Jhirka, has been filed. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
404	17.11.2024	11 of Prevention of Cruelty to Animal Act, 1960, Section 13 (2), 17, 5 of The Haryana Gauvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015 and Section 61 of BNS, 2023	Ferozpur Jhirka, District Nuh, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 11.03.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such prayed for confirming the interim bail granted vide order dated 11.03.2025.



CRM-M-13629-2025

2

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Raj Kumar, intimates the Court that the petitioner has joined investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.

4. During the course of hearing on 11.03.2025, following order was passed:

“ 2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that the petitioner has no concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR nor he is named in the FIR but has been nominated being the owner of the vehicle allegedly used in the occurrence. He contends that in fact the vehicle owned by the petitioner was used by his brother, namely Jagdish Prashad, who was also the driver of the vehicle and the same was purchased in the name of the petitioner only because his brother Jagdish Prashad was not in a position to get loan in his name. He contends that the petitioner was not indulged in any criminal activity, as has been alleged nor he had any concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR and the recovery was effected from the brother of the petitioner. Hence, the instant petition.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arun Kumar Gujjar, AAG, Haryana, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the Staterespondent and prays for time to file the status report/reply in the matter.

5. Adjourned to 01.04.2025.

6. Needful be done well before the date fixed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the



CRM-M-13629-2025

3

event of his arrest, he is ordered to be released on interim bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS).

8. Investigating Officer (concerned) to remain present in Court along with relevant records on the date fixed.”

5. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 11.03.2025 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 11.03.2025 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

6. The petition stands allowed.

7. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

01.04.2025

kanika

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