

2025:PHHC:005794



104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2121-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.01.2025

Mohd. Sahib @ Kallu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vikram Rathore, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manoj Kaushik, Advocate and
Mr. Shubh Karman Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.369
dated 15.06.2024 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 427 of the Indian Penal Code,
1860 (for short 'IPC') and Section 307 of IPC (added later on), registered at

2025:PHHC:005794



Police Station Suraj Kund, District Faridabad.


2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that injury on the head of son of the complainant is specifically attributed to co-accused Shahrukh and the petitioner is alleged to have given only leg and fist blows. The son of the complainant suffered two injuries, out of which, injury on his head was declared dangerous to life, as he was having multiple fractures on head and the same is attributed to co-accused Shahrukh, who has already been arrested. It is further contended that the petitioner along with seven more persons have been implicated in the FIR (*supra*).

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel appears on advance notice and assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and on instructions from ASI Narender, opposes the prayer made by the petitioner on the ground that the injury, which was declared dangerous to life, is found to have been given by the petitioner and injured Vivek has suffered multiple fractures on his head. The aforementioned fact came to light on the basis of CCTV footage of the incident, in which the petitioner was found to have inflicted the injury, which was declared dangerous to life.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.

5. Keeping in view the serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, this Court finds no ground to grant him the concession of

2025:PHHC:005794



anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

16.01.2025
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No