



217

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

**CRM-M-32783-2025**

**Date of Decision:22.07.2025**

Surender Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Gurmej Singh Bhinder, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. D.D.Sharma, Advocate, for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**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.514 dated 10.09.2023, registered under Sections 380, 454 of IPC, at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled by the complainant in the present case are highly improbable and unbelievable. Even no prudent person would believe that a jeweller would leave his jewellery shop unlocked, on getting a call from some one. In fact, there were financial transactions between the parties and even to avoid his financial liability, the complainant has got the present FIR registered against the present petitioner. He further contends that even after the registration of the FIR, an amount of Rs.12,000/- was transferred in the account of father of the petitioner by the complainant. This clearly shows that the allegations are palpably false and liable to be rejected by this Court. Learned counsel further contends that even the investigation was conducted in the present case and an

untrace report was prepared by the police on 26.10.2024. However, the investigation was again initiated against the petitioner under some hidden pressure and now the petitioner is sought to be implicated after almost 02 years.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had stolen the jewellery and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required. Apart from that, the petitioner is also facing another case under Section 324 of IPC.

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

5. It is not in dispute that earlier the petitioner had joined the investigation and an untrace report was prepared on 26.10.2024 by the police. Even the complainant is yet to prove the allegations before the trial Court to prove his charge against the present petitioner. At this stage, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

22.07.2025  
hemlata

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