



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

**CRM-M-25671-2025  
DECIDED ON: 10.07.2025**

**RAMESH** **.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA** **.....RESPONDENT**

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

Present: Ms. Garima Sharma, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok S. Choudhry, Addl. AG, Haryana.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)**

1. On 14.05.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

*“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:-*

<i>Name &amp; age of Petitioner (s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Ramesh, aged about 52 years</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>04.04.2019</i>	<i>379/420/467/468/473/411/474/489/201/120-B of IPC</i>	<i>Sector 40</i>	<i>Gurugram</i>

*2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that petitioner has already been granted bail in connection with the alleged theft of the car involved in FIR bearing No.123 dated 05.06.2020, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 473, 489, 201, 411, and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh, pertains to the same incident. The petitioner was granted bail by this Court, vide order dated 15.03.2021, passed in CRM-M-35013-2020 (Annexure P-4), after having remained in custody for approximately nine months.*

3. *It is submitted that the current proceedings arising out of a separate FIR relating to the same car, which is alleged to have been recovered from the petitioner by the UT Police. Counsel argues that for the same act of alleged theft, petitioner cannot be subjected to incarceration once again merely because another FIR has been registered in respect of the same vehicle. Thus, petitioner prays for the grant of anticipatory bail in the present case.*

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 10.07.2025.*

7. *Since, the FIR was registered in the year 2019 and as pointed out by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner remained inside jail for the period of more than 9 months, petitioner shall not be arrested, till the next date of hearing.”*

2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was unable to join the investigation, as there was no specific direction issued by this Court on the previous date of hearing requiring him to do so.

Additionally, counsel for the petitioner informs the Court that, subsequent to the registration of the FIR and during the pendency of the present petition, all offences, except under Section 379 of the IPC, have been deleted by the prosecution. Thus, counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is now willing to join the investigation, subject to the conditions that may be laid down by this Court in its order.

3. After considering all the circumstances, and noticing that there is no dispute raised by learned State counsel regarding the deletion of all other offences, except under Section 379 of the IPC, this Court

finds it appropriate to direct the petitioner to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency.

4. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory 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.).

5. 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.

6. However, it is clarified that in case, petitioner fails to join the investigation as and when called upon by the investigating agency, it will be open for the prosecution to move an appropriate application for recalling the present bail order.

7. Accordingly, present petition stands disposed of.

10.07.2025

*Lavisha*

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable*              *Yes/No*