



216

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

CRM-M-24392-2025

Date of Decision:08.07.2025

Constable Naveen Kumar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Narender Kaajla, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.18 dated 05.08.2022, under Sections 7, 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Anti-Corruption Bureau, Hisar.
2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 19.05.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that Suman Devi wife of Raj Kumar had filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. against her husband in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Bhiwani. The family Court had issued conditional warrants against Raj Kumar on 08.10.2018 and the petitioner was deputed to execute the arrest warrants of Raj Kumar. The petitioner went to the house of the Raj Kumar, but he was not found on that day. Again, the petitioner went to the house of Raj Kumar on 17.12.2018 and the petitioner apprehended Raj Kumar at the spot. However, 2-3 more persons came at the spot and Raj Kumar and Pawan Kumar had beaten the petitioner and had torned his uni

form and had fled away from the spot. The petitioner made a complaint to the police and one FIR No.998 dated 18.12.2018, under Sections 186, 323, 353, 506 & 34 IPC, Police Station City Bhiwani, District Bhiwani (Annexure P-1) was registered against Raj Kumar, Pawan and 2/3 unknown persons. He further contends that later on the petitioner came to know that the complainant side had made a complaint to the police against the petitioner and on the basis of some alleged enquiry, the FIR was registered by the police on 05.08.2022. He further contends that the police had allegedly relied upon a recording of conversation between Pawan Kumar, brother of the complainant and Somvir, co-accused. He further contends that even the police had not sent the original device for conversation to the FSL and only 4 DVDs-R were sent to FSL for analysis of the voice samples.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

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

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

6. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 19.05.2025 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.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

08.07.2025

hemlata

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