



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

307

**CRM-M No.33828 of 2025
Date of decision : 30.7.2025**

Jai Singh**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana and another**Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Nikhil Sehrawat, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Anshul Mangla, Advocate, for the complainant/
respondent no.2

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.166 dated 4.6.2025, under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 17, HUDA, Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. On 3.7.2025, the following order was passed:

'Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.166 dated 04.06.2025 registered for offences punishable under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sector 17, HUDA, Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia contends that the petitioner is aged about 75 years; the petitioner and the complainant-side are inter-locked in (civil litigation)



since the year 2013 & the petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein. In order to buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the dicta of the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar, 2014 AIR (SCW) 3930, and reiterated in Md. Asfak Alam Vs. The State of Jharkhand & Anr., 2023 AIR (Supreme Court) 3610.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Adjourned to 28.07.2025.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 07.07.2025 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.'

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from SI Vinod Kumar) submits that pursuant to the order dated 3.7.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3.1 Learned counsel for the complainant has filed short reply by way of affidavit of complainant dated 28.7.2025. Same be kept on record. A copy thereof has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Raising submissions in tandem with the said affidavit, learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the offence committed is serious in nature and thus, he ought not to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel has further iterated that in case petitioner is extended the concession of bail, there is all the likelihood that



he may flee from the hands of justice and may influence the prosecution witnesses/evidence.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and not required for custodial interrogation by the State, this Court deems it appropriate to confirm the interim protection granted vide order dated 3.7.2025.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The interim order dated 3.7.2025, passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

30.7.2025

Ashwani

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No