

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PII IC:113971



(207-A) CRM-M-28292-2025
Decided on : 27.08.2025
ManishPetitioner(s)
Versus
State of HaryanaRespondent(s)
CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Pardeep Balyan, Advocate, for the petitioner (s).
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Anmol Jindal, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.123 dated 08.04.2025 registered under Sections 110, 115, 3(5), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Murthal, District Sonipat.
2. On 28.05.2025, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.123 dated 08.04.2025 registered under Sections 110, 115, 3(5), 351(3) of BNS, at Police Station Murthal, District Sonipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant Naresh and his brother Suresh are habitual of consuming liquor at public places at night and under the influence of liquor, they had illegally entered the house of the petitioner on 06.04.2025 and started abusing the petitioner and his family members. They even caused injuries to Manisha, who was pregnant and the matter was reported to the police, vide complaint dated 07.04.2025 (Annexure P-1). Even earlier, the complainant and his brother had forcibly

entered the house of uncle, namely Pyare and caused head injury to him. Due to old enmity, the petitioner has been falsely named by alleging that he was carrying an axe in his hand and caused an injury on the head of the complainant and on the hand of complainant's brother. She further contends that the injury on the head suffered by the complainant is lacerated wound and is simple in nature.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

At this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation. In the event of arrest, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

Adjourned to 27.08.2025.

To be heard along with CRM-M-29813-2025."

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from ASI Sumit) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is required for further custodial interrogation for effecting recovery of the weapon in question.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the

likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein except for alleged non-recovery of the weapon in question, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 28.05.2025 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. Ordered accordingly.

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 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

August 27, 2025

Naveen

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

