



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

104

CRM-M-30888-2025
Date of decision: 06.06.2025

Anil

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Kamaldeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Mamta Singla Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mohit Khatkar, Advocate for the complainant.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.39 dated 15.03.2025, under Sections 121(1), 127(2), 132, 190, 191(3), 324 (4) of BNS, registered at Police Station Titram, Kaithal District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged occurrence. He further contends that the petitioner has made a complaint against the complainant before the different authorities even in National Commission of Women and the present FIR is counterblast of the same. He further contends that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation as and when called upon to do so.

3. Notice of motion.



4. On the asking of Court, Ms. Mamta Singla Talwar, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State and submits that there are serious allegations against the petitioner as he has damaged the government vehicle, photographs of the same are on record. She further submits that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, since, he attacked the police party and caused injuries to one of them. Therefore, he be not granted concession of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the file with their able assistance.

6. A perusal of the file would show that there are direct allegations against the petitioner who attacked the police party and caused injuries to a public servant who was on duty and also damaged the government vehicle. Therefore, I do not find any merit in the present case, as the investigation of the case is at initial stage for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

7. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

06.06.2025

Yogesh

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No