

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

CRM-M-34114-2025
Reserved on: 01.08.2025
Pronounced on: 28.08.2025

Prince Jakhar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. S.S.Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate with
Mr. Rahul Gugnani, Advocate and
Mr. Abhinav Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
375	12.06.2025	Mujessar, Faridabad	148/ 149/ 323/ 341/ 307/ 427/ 506 of IPC

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Per paragraph 13 of the bail application and 9 of the status report filed by the State, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Year	Offenses	Police Station
1	320	2019	-	Mujeser (untraced)
2	285	2020	-	Mujeser (under trial)
3	23	2021	-	Mujeser (under trial)
4	3	2018	379(B)/506 IPC	BPTP, Faridabad

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

*“2. That a criminal case bearing FIR No. 375 dated 12.06.2024 U/s 148, 149, 323, 341, 307, 427 and 506 IPC was registered at Police Station Mujeser District Faridabad on the basis of a complaint made by the complainant/Chanchal.
The complainant stated in her complaint that on 12.06.2024,*

the complainant had filed a written complaint for lodging FIR alleging therein that she had a land dispute with Prakash Kaur and she lodged a complaint against her on 09.06.2024 at Police Station. The complainant alongwith her husband and children were going to Police Station for compromise, but on the way the petitioner alongwith his father Ajit Jakhar, Amit and Prakash Kaur came in a fortuner vehicle bearing Registration no. HR-29-AP-1008, one Scorpio and four motorcycles came their and hit the car of complainant multiple times, so that the WagonR car no. HR-51-CC-0934 and creta no. HR-87-L-4948 of the complainant party were badly damaged. The complainant party some how managed to come to the police station but even in the police station also, the aforesaid accused persons hit their cars with intention to commit their murder in which complainant and her family member were seating and then they fled away from the spot, while firing in the air. Hence, the present case (Annexure P-1 already annexed) was registered.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

“ROLE OF THE PETITIONER:

5. That in the present case, the petitioner was driving Fortuner vehicle at the time of occurrence.”

8. The petitioner tried to behave like a Bahubali, a gangster, and indulged in hooliganism. This fact is further strengthened from petitioner's criminal antecedents. However, this Court cannot also ignore the fact of the nature of injuries received by the complainant and manner of attack which is cruel.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify the grant of anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

11. **Petition dismissed.** Interim orders, if any, are recalled with immediate effect. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

28.08.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.