

**CRM-M-33664-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Sr. No.210****Case No. : CRM-M-33664-2025****Decided On : September 09, 2025**

Parvej Khan Petitioner
vs.
State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P. K. Garg, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arjun Dhingra, Advocate
with Ms. Palkin Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, read with Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (old), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.221 dated 20.04.2025, under Sections 110, 115, 117(2), 126, 190, 191(3) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station Indri, District Karnal.

The brief facts of the case are that the aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by one Mahender Singh, wherein he stated that on 19.04.2025, he along with his son namely Lavish and driver Kuldeep had gone to village Bir Majri with their Tractor and Reaper Chaff Making Machine. When they were making chaff in the fields of one Omi



Lal around 07:00-08:00 PM, 15-20 boys on 4/5 motorcycles, with dandas in their hands, came there and attacked upon them. The complainant and his son suffered injuries on their legs, head and shoulders. After hearing their noise, people around the spot gathered there and assailants fled from the spot along with their weapons, leaving behind one motorcycle bearing registration No.HR-75-A-0547, while threatening the complainant party of dire consequences. The complainant further submitted that his son Lavish became unconscious. Both of them were shifted to Civil Hospital after dialling helpline No.112. According to MLRs of complainant and his son Lavish, the complainant suffered four injuries and his son suffered five injuries, out of which two injuries were found grievous. Thus, the complainant sought action against all the culprits.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that no specific role or injury has been attributed to the petitioner. So far as previous enmity is concerned, it was with Aakrish and Prince, according to own version of injured Lavish and not with the petitioner. Nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner is young boy of 19 years of age. He is ready and willing to join the investigation. He urged that the petitioner is not required for any interrogation and he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present bail petition and has contended that the petitioner, along with 15-20 persons, attacked the complainant and his son, thereby causing injuries to both of them. His custodial interrogation is required for fair and proper investigation. So, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail. However, he has fairly



admitted that there is no other case registered against the present petitioner.

Heard.

As per the allegations in the present FIR, the petitioner, in league with other co-accused, inflicted injuries on the person of the complainant and his son. The petitioner, along with other co-accused, allegedly came on their motorcycles and encircled the field where the complainant and his son was working, so that no person from the village could free them from their assault. Then they all together stopped tractor of the complainant and made them alight from the tractor and started beating them with dands and bindas.

As per the Status Report, in the video of CCTV footage produced by the complainant, the petitioner and other co-accused were visible going on motorcycles towards the place of occurrence, whereas no CCTV footage covering the place of occurrence is available, to infer that the petitioner was present at the place of occurrence at the time of alleged incident. No specific role or injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents and no other criminal case has been registered against him. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and nothing is to be recovered from him. So, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing bail/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions, as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating



Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

September 09, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>