



CRM-M No.34467 of 2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

108

CRM-M No.34467 of 2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 04.07.2025

Anish Soni

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T, Chandigarh

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU****Present:** Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.P.Singh, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

\*\*\*\*

**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.**

Present petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') read with Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr.P.C.'), for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.170 dated 24.09.2024 (P-1), under Sections 118(1) read with Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') [Sections 115(2), 117(2), 140(4) and 238 of BNS added later on], registered at Police Station Central Sector 17, Chandigarh.

2. Allegations are that petitioner along with other co-accused in furtherance of their common intention caused grievous injuries on the person of *de facto* complainant/injured-Sumit Jalvi.

3. Contends that in the initial version, petitioner was not named; rather nominated on the basis of supplementary statement dated 02.10.2024 made by *de facto* complainant-Sumit Jalvi. Also contends that petitioner has

**CRM-M No.34467 of 2025     2**

been falsely implicated in the present case. Lastly contends that petitioner is ready to join the investigation, but he be protected.

4.            *Per contra*, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, UT, Chandigarh vehemently opposed the prayer while submitting that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per MLR dated 24.09.2024, *de facto*-complainant had suffered nine injuries and out of those, injury Nos.5 & 9 are grievous in nature. Also submits that petitioner is facing another criminal case bearing FIR No.77 dated 12.06.2022 under Sections 147, 148, 379, 427, 395, 506 read with Section 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'IPC') & Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Mauli Jagran, UT Chandigarh. Lastly submits that in case petitioner is released on pre-arrest bail, there is every likelihood of interfering with fair investigation.

5.            Heard learned counsel for both the sides and perused the paper book.

6.            There is no quarrel that in the initial version, petitioner was not named; but complainant has specifically stated in his supplementary statement dated 02.10.2024 that petitioner had actively participated in the commission of alleged crime along with other co-accused. Furthermore, nine injuries were caused on the person of *de facto* complainant and out of which two are opined to be grievous in nature. Apart that, petitioner is facing one another criminal case i.e FIR No.77 dated 12.06.2022 (*supra*). Thus, in order to recover the alleged weapon of offence used by the petitioner and to know the true facts, his custodial interrogation would be very much necessary.

7.            Consequently, there is no option, except to dismiss the petition.

8.            Ordered accordingly.

9.            Needless to say that above observations be not construed as an



CRM-M No.34467 of 2025     3

expression of opinion on merits of allegations, in any manner.

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

04.07.2025

Rajeev (rvs)/SN

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned                      Yes/No

Whether reportable                                      Yes/No