

**CRM-M-34264-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Case No. : CRM-M-34264-2025****Pronounced On : August 20, 2025**

Onkar Singh @ Rai Singh Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R. K. Singla, Addl. A. G., Haryana.

Mr. Tarun Chawla, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.240 dated 07.06.2025, under Sections 121(1), 126, 132, 221, 3(5), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Sirsa.

Brief facts of the case are that the FIR in hand was registered on the basis of complaint made by one Deepak Kumar, SDO, alleging therein that he and his associate namely Ankit Singla, while going to their official duty, were assaulted by the petitioner and three other persons. The reason behind this assault was given by the complainant that the petitioner is a Government Contractor and was nursing grudge against the complainant



for not passing his illegal bills and not working as per his whims and fancies. On the other hand, petitioner's version was that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the complainant was demanding bribe from him for supplying pipes and he even sold the pipes of petitioner to some other contractor. On asking, the complainant demanded money from the petitioner and threatened to implicate him in false case. The petitioner also levelled allegations of misbehave against the complainant. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner moved complaint against the complainant before Superintendent of Police, Sirsa and Deputy Commissioner, Sirsa, as a counter-blast of which, the FIR in question was registered against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present FIR is counter-blast to the complaint made by the petitioner against the complainant for demanding bribe, which is still pending. Moreover, the complainant himself is facing prosecution in FIR No.0001 dated 10.01.2023 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Anti Corruption Bureau, Hisar, for demanding bribe to pass the bills. Learned counsel further submitted that at the time of alleged occurrence, the petitioner was not present at the alleged place of occurrence, which fact is verifiable from CCTV footage. There is also unexplained delay of 24 hours in lodging the FIR. Prior to the present incident, on 13.05.2025, the petitioner had some altercation with the complainant. The petitioner informed senior officers of the complainant, as a result of which, the said assignment was withdrawn from the complainant and given to some other officer. Keeping grudge in his mind of that incident

**CRM-M-34264-2025****3**

dated 13.05.2025, the complainant lodged the FIR in question with the allegations of assault against the petitioner, whereas medical evidence does not corroborate the version of the complainant. It is also case of the petitioner that he was working as a Contractor in Public Health Department for the last ten years and when he raised voice against demand of bribe, he has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the petitioner is not required for any interrogation and no recovery is to be effected from him. It has, therefore, been prayed that the petitioner be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition for anticipatory bail while contending that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. It has come to notice during investigation that the petitioner was holding a *binda* in his hand and he gave blows at the back and shoulder of the complainant with the said *binda*. Apart from this, he is also involved in three other criminal cases. So, he is a habitual offender and his custodial interrogation is required to know the whereabouts of other co-accused accompanying him at the time of commission of the crime in question. So, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations in the present FIR, the petitioner and his co-accused blocked the way of complainant and his associate, when they were on their official duty and attacked them with *binda*. However, it has also come on record that both – the complainant and his associate were advised X-ray by the concerned doctor, but both of them did not turn up for X-ray and therefore, doctor could not opine about the nature of the injuries



suffered by them. Both the parties are levelling allegations and counter allegations against each other, which is a matter of trial. 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.

August 20, 2025

monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No.
Whether reportable ?	Yes/No.