

2025:PHHC:117704



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
217
CRM-M No.41831 of 2025
Date of decision: 01.09.2025

Karamvir ... Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
124	13.05.2025	Nigdhu Karnal, District Karnal	351(2), 3(5), 126 and 115 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (110 and 117(2) of BNS added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a statement recorded by the victim-Madan Lal, alleging that in the morning of 09.05.2025, the petitioner and his son Prince had opened an attack

2025:PHHC:117704



upon him and had caused injuries to him. The petitioner was carrying a sharp-edged weapon at that time. He recorded that sometime before that he along with a co-villager Ram Niwas had gone to his agricultural land over which a dispute had taken place between the above-named Ram Niwas and the petitioner. He also recorded that the petitioner had involved him in false cases previously. Initially, a case under Sections 115, 126, 351(2) read with Section 3(5) of BNS was registered. During investigation, offence under Section 117(2) of BNS was added. The petitioner was arrested and was released on bail vide order dated 15.05.2025. Subsequently, offence under Section 110 of BNS was added. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 17.07.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been extended benefit of regular bail. After addition of offence under Section 110 of BNS, his custodial interrogation is not required. The victim did not sustain any injury on vital part of his body. No specific injury has been attributed to him. He is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed upon him. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate

2025:PHHC:117704



General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner had been extended benefit of regular bail before inclusion of offence under Section 110 of BNS. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Neither any recovery is to be effected from him. As such, this Court is of the opinion that a case for grant of pre arrest bail is made out in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his appearing before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of 15 days from today and joining investigation and subject to furnishing fresh personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer. He shall join further proceedings also till conclusion of the investigation.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

01.09.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No