



2026:PHHC:086743



106

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

**CRM-M-32958-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 05.06.2026**

JAGDEEP SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. S.S. Chahal, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of B.N.S.S. (Section 438 of CrPC) for the grant of Anticipatory bail to the Petitioner in case FIR No.092 dated 04.05.2026 Under Section 303(2) of B.N.S., (Section 379 IPC), registered at Police Station, Sadar Ratia, District Fatehabad. (Annexure P-1)

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been implicated in the present FIR solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by co-accused-Gursewak and he was not named in the FIR initially. It has further been submitted that all the stolen articles were recovered from the co-



accused. Learned counsel contends that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner in the FIR and the assertions made therein are vague and weak in nature. On such basis, it is argued that the liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed. Therefore, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of Court, Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. She opposes the prayer for grant of bail asserting that as per the allegations the petitioner alongwith co-accused Gursewak committed theft of three doors, articles of electricity fitting, water taps, iron chairs and other articles from the office of Gram Panchayat, village Jallopur. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for the effective investigation of the present case, therefore, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner has been implicated in the present FIR solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by Gursewak and that he was not named in the FIR initially, moreover, the stolen articles were recovered from the co-accused and not from the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.



4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of 10 days from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of ten days, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

05.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No Notice of motion.