



111

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

CRM-M-17205-2025

Date of Decision: 05.04.2025

RAHUL

....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS**STATE OF HARYANA**

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Pardeep Duhan, Advocate for
Dr. Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed by petitioner – Rahul aged 30 years, for seeking direction to the respondents to conduct fair and impartial investigation in FIR No.83 dated 15.03.2025, under Sections 115, 118(1) and 3(5) of BNSS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sector 5, Panchkula, Haryana (Annexure P-1).

2. At the time of filing of the petition, apprehension of the petitioner was that official respondents i.e. investigating officer is in connivance with the accused persons as the accused are not being arrested.

3. Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, appearing on advance notice files status report dated 03.04.2025 and submits that there are total 03 accused. Accused Lucky @ Ninja and Rohit @ Kala are already there in the police custody after they being arrested and third accused namely Sagar had been granted anticipatory bail by the Court of



CRM-M-17205-2025

2

Sessions at Panchkula vide order dated 26.03.2025 by directing him to join investigation.

4. Faced with the facts disclosed in the status report, counsel for the petitioner states that the present petition be disposed of, as the same is not being pressed, at this stage by the petitioner. However, he seeks liberty to move an application at appropriate stage before an appropriate forum, in accordance with law, because there is a strong belief that the prime offence attracting the ingredients of Section 307 IPC has not been invoked by the investigating agency, despite noticing of the injuries of serious nature in medico legal report dated 14.03.2025.

5. Upon this, learned AAG Haryana, submits that medical opinion is yet to be obtained from the concerned Doctor, therefore, apprehension expressed by the petitioner – complainant is premature.

6. Be that as it may, present petition is **disposed of**, same being not pressed, however liberty is granted to the petitioner, as sought and recorded hereabove.

April 05, 2025
Sangeeta

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No