



202+211

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

Date of Decision: 25.02.2025

CRM-M-65552-2024

SUNIL KUMAR
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA

....Petitioner(s)

....Respondent(s)

CRM-M-65554-2024

BALWANT
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA

....Petitioner(s)

....Respondent(s)

CRM-M-65509-2024

VIKAS
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA

....Petitioner(s)

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Samay Sandhawalia, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(Video Conferencing).

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate with
Mr. Bharat Julka, Advocate and
Ms. Sunita Devi, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

By way of this common order, aforementioned three petitions are being decided together, as all of these have arisen from one FIR.

1. Prayer in these petition(s), filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s), who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
1. Sunil Kumar (in CRM-M-65552-2024) 2. Balwant (in CRM-M-65554-2024) 3. Vikas (in CRM-M-65509-2024)	191	27.06.2024	323, 506, 285, 148, 149 of IPC and 25 of the Arms Act (Section 307 of IPC added later on)	Tohana Sadar	Fatehabad



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that in compliance of the order dated 26.12.2024 in CRM-M-65509-2024 and order dated 08.01.2025 in CRM-M-65552-2024 & CRM-M-65554-2024, passed by this Court, the petitioner(s) have joined the investigation, and have fully co-operated.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Mahender Singh, while filing status report dated 24.02.2025 (separately in all three cases), confirms the said averment and submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner(s) would not be required now for the purpose of investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant, vehemently opposes the contention of bail and submits that petitioner(s) are not entitled for bail as presence at the spot and have also causing injury, is almost an admitted fact.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Considering the submissions made on behalf of the parties, this Court is of the view that being it a case of version and cross-version, the authenticity of the truthfulness of the one is to be ascertained after leading of the evidence before the Id. Trial Court. Once the investigation has been joined by the accused persons (petitioner(s) herein) and their custodial interrogation is not demanded by the prosecution agency, prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioners is worth to be accepted. Thus all three petitions are hereby **allowed** and ad-interim orders dated 26.12.2024 in CRM-M-65509-2024 and order(s) dated 08.01.2025 in CRM-M-65552-



2024 & CRM-M-65554-2024, passed by this Court are hereby made absolute.

However, petitioner(s) shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition(s) stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

February 25, 2025
Sangeeta

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No