



CRM-M No.12537 of 2025 1

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

221

**CRM-M No.12537 of 2025
Date of decision: 07.07.2025**

Vasim Alias Vassi

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Amas Ahmed, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. Anmol Partap Singh Mann, Advocate and
Mr. Navjot Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.30 dated 04.02.2025 under Sections 115, 190, 191 (3), 140 (3), 351 (3), 61 of BNSS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Nuh, District Nuh.

2. On the last date of hearing on 06.03.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, even as per the case of the complainant, was not one of those persons who allegedly abducted him and thereafter bundled him into a waiting car before fleeing

away from the spot. It has been submitted that although the petitioner has been named in the FIR in question, however, the only role, if any, attributed to the petitioner by the complainant is that he was seemingly involved in the conspiracy behind the abduction of the complainant. It has been further submitted that other than this, no other role has been attributed to the petitioner, much less of having assaulted the complainant.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he has replied in the negative.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 06.03.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency, hence the aforesaid order be made absolute.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation. However, it has been submitted that the petitioner has not fully co-operated with the investigating agency as he has failed to disclose the names of some of his other accomplices who too were present along with the names of the accused at the time of the alleged abduction.

5. On being pointedly asked, as to whether any specific role had been attributed to the petitioner in the alleged abduction of the complainant, learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the FIR which has been reproduced in the body of the petition. Learned State counsel has however, failed to point out any specific role attributed to the petitioner in the FIR in question other

than an apprehension raised by the complainant that the petitioner was a conspirator to the crime in question.

6. On being pointedly asked, whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, learned State counsel has replied in the negative.

7. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 06.03.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

**July 07,2025
archana**

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