



CRM-M-2514-2025

1

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

205-3

CRM-M-2514-2025

Date of decision: 27.08.2025

Satish Kumar

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Satish Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Shahbaz Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG Punjab.
Mr. Ravinder Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.129 dated 30.11.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station City-II Abohar, District Fazilka.

2. On 29.01.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Status report dated 20.01.2025 by way of an affidavit of Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Brar, PPS, Deputy Supdt. of Police, Sub-Division Abohar, District Fazilka has been filed on behalf of respondent-State, which is taken on record. Copy supplied to the other sides. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

Contentends that co-accused, namely Dhola Singh and Mangtu Ram have already been granted interim protection by the Coordinate bench as well as by this Bench on 02.01.2025 and 09.01.2025, respectively.

Posted for 03.02.2025.

In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation before the Investigating Officer, but he be not arrested till the next date of hearing.

To be heard along with CRM-M-11-2025”



3. Thereafter, on 27.05.2025, the following order was passed in this case:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner(s), on instructions, submits that there are chances of an amicable settlement between the parties i.e. petitioner(s) as well as de facto complainant at their own level.

Posted for 05.08.2025.

Till the next date of hearing, interim order(s) in respective case(s) to continue.

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

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 29.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

5. Learned counsel appearing for complainant has vociferously opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature and hence he ought not be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of the above, the interim order dated 29.01.2025 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. 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.

8. 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, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.



CRM-M-2514-2025

3

9. 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

August 27, 2025

Ajay

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No