

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

**CRM-M No.33444 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025**

Satbir and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Mr. Amit Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.


Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana for the respondent.

Mr. Sachin Kaushik, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short* 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners in FIR No.224 dated 15.06.2025, under Sections 110, 115, 191(3) read with Section 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (*for short* 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Gannaur, District Sonipat.

2025:PHHC:082002



(2) Allegations are that petitioners, along with other co-accused, formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object, inflicted injuries on the person of complainant party with their respective weapons.

(3) Learned Counsel for the petitioners has produced copy of MLR dated 14.06.2025 of one Amit, which is taken on record as Mark 'X'. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

(4) Contends that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and as a matter of fact, petitioners' side also suffered injuries and reference in this regard has been made to MLR dated 14.06.2025 (*ibid*). Specifically contends that police is not taking any action against the complainant side based on the complaint made by petitioners' side. Lastly contends that petitioners are ready to join the investigation; but they be protected.

(5) *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, on instructions, opposed the prayer on the premise that *Farsa* blow was given to the injured and he is hospitalized for the last more than three weeks up till now; thus, injuries attributed to the petitioners are serious in nature, therefore, they do not deserve the concession of bail.

(6) Similar objection has been raised by learned Counsel for the complainant.

2025:PHHC:082002



(7) Heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

(8) A bare glance of the aforesaid MLR clearly indicates that injury inflicted on the person of victim is grievous in nature and more particularly, on vital part of the body i.e. head; therefore, this Court is of opinion that custodial interrogation of petitioners would be very much necessary to unearth the truth and for recovery of alleged weapon (*Farsa*).

(9) In view of the above, there is no option except to dismiss the petition.

(10) Ordered accordingly.

(11) The above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

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

9th July, 2025
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>