



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-43144-2024  
Date of decision: September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Ashutosh  
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Aggarwal  
and Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocates  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Deputy Advocate General,  
Haryana.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

On the last date of hearing, while issuing notice of motion,  
the following order was passed:-

*“Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.526 dated 01.08.2024 under Sections 115, 118(1), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 324(4) of the BNS (Sections 117(2), 118(2) of the BNS added lateron) registered at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that although the petitioner has been named in the FIR in question and it has been alleged that he along with all the other accused were armed with lethal weapons like iron rods, gandasi, etc., however, the CCTV footage retrieved from the place of occurrence speaks a different story and reflects that the petitioner was unarmed and had not inflicted any injury on the person of the complainant or the injured person.*

*Notice of motion.*

*On asking of the Court, Ms. Trishanjali Sharma,*



**CRM-M-43144-2024**

**-2-**

*DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to get necessary instructions.*

*Adjourned to 18.09.2024.”*

2. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by submitting that in the CCTV footage, which was retrieved by the investigating agency, the petitioner was not only clearly visible but was also seen actively participating in the occurrence in question; the petitioner was armed with an iron rod with which he inflicted multiple injuries on the person of injured-Sandeep; resultantly, injured-Sandeep sustained fractures on both of his arms, which find due corroboration with the medical evidence on record.
3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.
4. In view of the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court is not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
5. The instant petition stands dismissed.
6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024**  
*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No