



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

300

CRM-M-36592-2025

Date of decision: 18th July, 2025

Parampal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 139 dated 19.05.2025 registered under Section 303(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations, on 28-01-2025, wooden logs kept in the courtyard of the house of the complainant had been stolen by someone. As some images were captured in the CCTV camera installed in the house of the complainant, he started conducting inquiry at his own level and came to know that, those wooden logs were taken away by accused Kaka in connivance with the present petitioner and kept in the house of the petitioner. He alleged that on 30-01-2025, while passing through the house



of the petitioner, he had seen him while cutting the logs and had identified the same. While alleging that the petitioner along with the accused Kaka had committed theft in his house, he prayed for taking action. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge Sirsa, vide order dated 04.07.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, a quarrel had taken place between him and the complainant. He himself had sustained injuries and remained admitted in hospital. A DDR No. 14 dated 03-02-2025 was registered by him at Police Station Sadar, Dabawali. The FIR of this case was a counter-blast to the same. There is an inordinate delay in lodging of the FIR, which is not at all explained. His custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready to join the investigation. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He was named in the FIR. Recovery of stolen wood is to be effected from him. Co-accused Pargat Singh @ Kaka Singh had suffered disclosed statement to the effect that the stolen wood was sold by him to the present petitioner. There are no exceptional and extra-ordinary circumstances for grant of pre-arrest bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable



length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have purchased wooden logs belonging to the complainant and stolen by the co-accused Pargat Singh. As stated by learned State counsel, in the CCTV footage, only accused Pargat Singh was seen coming and removing the wooden logs. The matter was reported to the police on 04.02.2025, i.e. after a delay of seven days and FIR was lodged much thereafter. Given the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, I am of the considered opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required and no case is made out for custodial interrogation of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to anticipatory bail, subject to his surrendering before the Arresting/Investigating Officer within a period of ten days from today and on his joining investigation and further subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

18th July, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*