

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36308-2025
Reserved on: 01.08.2025
Pronounced on: 27.08.2025

Satbir ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

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

Ms. Jasmine Gill, A.A.G., Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
82	22.02.2025	City Gohana, Sonipat	110/ 115/ 118(1)/ 126/ 190/ 191(3)/ 351(2) BNS (Section 109(1) BNS added later on)

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 12 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the translated version of FIR, which reads as follows:

“To SHO PS Gohana City. Sir it is stated that I Anil s/o Sultan am resident of Village Wazirpur District Sonipat and my mother father are alive and we are four brothers (self, Deepak, Mohit, Sonu) and around 6 months ago family of Satbir @Kala s/o Pyare Lal had a quarrel with our family over street water, which was later on settled. But yesterday on dated 21.02.25 at around 7.30 pm my younger brother Mohit called me up and told that keeping in mind the old rivalry, Suraj @ Abdula s/o aforesaid Satbir and his friend Vinod and his brother Manoj s/o Rajesh without any reason are quarrelling with him at Shiv Mandir Chowk and have surrounded him. Upon receiving call from my brother Mohit, me and my brother Deepak immediately reached at the spot and after we reached Vinod, Manoj and Suraj and apart from them his family members Karambir s/o Pyare Lal, Krishan s/o Pyare Lal, Satbir s/o Pyare Lal and Vinod @ Makand s/o Karambir and others attacked us by stopping the

passage in the street. Suraj attacked me with ice pic, Satbir attacked with axe and the others attacked with the sticks in their hands. When we all three brothers started shouting for help, then my father Sultan s/o Jai Narayan and my uncle Pawan s/o Dharam Singh, on hearing the noise came at the spot to rescue us. All the accused attacked them also. All the accused kept beating me and my family members. All the accused gave beatings to us and threatened to kill us and fled from the spot with their weapons, after which our other family members came and picked us from the spot and got us admitted in Civil Hospital Gohana from where we were referred PGI Khanpur where treatment is going on. It is requested that strict legal: Action be taken against Suraj, Vinod s/o Rajesh, Manoj s/o Rajesh, Krishan s/o Pyare Lal, Karambir s/o Pyare Lal, Vinod s/o Karambir, Satbir s/o Pyarelal and others. Sd/- Anil".

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 relevant portion of para 5 of the status report, which read as follows:

"The perusal of Opinion revealed that: Injuries No. 1, 2,4,5,6 mentioned in MLR NO BPS/SJ/21022025/A dated 2102/2025 can be caused by this weapon (Ice Breaking Tools)."

8. In the FIR, the injury attributed to the petitioner is with an axe (gandasi). Allegations are that all the accused caused injuries to the victim and petitioner cannot take benefit of not sharing common intention. Considering the petitioner being name in the FIR having axe (gandasi) and coupled with the fact that the said weapon is yet to be recovered, petitioner is not entitled to bail.

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.

CRM-M-36308-2025

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

27.08.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No.