



212

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

**CRM-M-22403-2025(O&M)**

**Date of Decision:09.07.2025**

Sandeep Sharma

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

**Present :** Ms.Pooja Jaglan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.60, dated 25.01.2025, under Sections 305-A, 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, Panipat, Haryana.

2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 28.04.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the complainant were having business dealings and on 18.01.2025 on the asking of the complainant and with prior permission of the complainant, the employees of the present petitioner had taken away the rejected pieces of certain commodities and these were taken to his premises for repairing them. Learned counsel next submits that even as per the CCTV footage, no person was carrying*

*any arm in their hand and a financial dispute has been illegally converted into a criminal offence. ”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Naresh, also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had trespassed in the property of the complainant and had damaged the household articles. He further contends that the present petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. It is not in dispute that in compliance of the interim order dated 28.04.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and as per learned State counsel, his custody may not be required, at this stage.

8. At this stage, without looking into rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 28.04.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

9. Pending application(s) stand(s) also disposed of.

**(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

**09.07.2025**  
hemlata

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