

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50303-2025
Reserved on: 16.09.2025
Pronounced on: 22.09.2025

Parvinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Pragyat Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Birender Bikram Attrey, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
125	12.08.2025	Farakpur, Distt. Yamuna Nagar	109(1), 115, 191(3) and 351(2) of BNS

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. As per paragraph 12 of the bail petition and 10 (x) of the status report, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Offenses	Police Station
1.	16	22.01.2024	148, 149, 323, 506 IPC	Farakpur
2.	21	21.01.2025	190, 191(3), 115(2), 351(2), 324(4) of BNS	Farakpur
3.	25	24.01.2022	21(b), 29 of NDPS Act	Farakpur
4.	134	01.04.2022	21(b), 29 of NDPS Act	Gandhi Nagar
5.	233	17.09.2023	21(b), 29 of NDPS Act	Sadhaura

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the translated copy of the FIR attached to the bail petition, which reads as follows:

“Copy of statement, its contents are follows: statement of Deepak Kumar son of Sh. Suman Sharma, resident of Village Sasauli, Police Station Farakpur, District Yamunanagar, aged 32 years, hereby state that I am a resident of the aforementioned address and work as a farmer. My elder brother, Ishant Sharma alias Ishu, was a victim of an attempted murder by Prince Bairagi, Rhythm Sharma, Babbu, and others in 2023 New Year. My brother and I filed a case, FIR No.01 dated 01.01.2023 under Sections 307, 34 of IPC and the Arms Act at Police Station Farakpur. As I gave testimony in the Hon'ble Court in this case because of this case, Rhythm Verma, son of Rajan Verma, resident of Govind Vihar, Sasauli, holds a

grudge against me. He has tried to attack me multiple times by bringing other boys with him. On 11.08.2025, in the evening, I received a call my mobile number 84101xxx unknown number. The caller claimed to be my well-wisher and asked to meet. My friend, Imran son of Sharafat Ali, resident of Sasrauli, and I were riding on a motorcycle bearing No. HR0224139 and arrived near Holy Mother School in Kansapur. My friend Imran was riding the motorcycle and I was sitting behind him. At around 6:45 PM, a boy was standing there in a Creta car. A little while later, a Baleno car of a grey color arrived with 4-5 boys inside. As I got off the motorcycle, the driver of the Baleno car, with the intention of killing me, drove the car over me. He then reversed the car off my legs. The boys who were in the car-Prince Bairagi, resident of Sudail, Rhythm Verma, resident of Sasauli, Babbu Punjabi Rasoi Walla, the Gagan, resident of Sudail-got out of the car, each holding an iron rod. They told me that they would kill me today and make me pay the price for testifying against them in the case. Rhythm Sharma struck me on the head with the iron rod he was holding, but I immediately moved my right arm forward to protect myself. My friend Imran tried to stop them, but they scared him away by threatening to kill him. Babbu grabbed my legs, and Prince Bairagi, Rhythm Verma, Gagan, and another boy hit me on both arms, both legs, and my body with iron rods and with an iron awl(sua). The boy in the Creta car fled the spot with his vehicle. The passers-by intervened, and all the attackers left me in a semi-conscious state, got into with their their Baleno car with their weapons and fled. They all conspired to kill me. While leaving, they told my friend, "He survived today, but if we see him again, we will kill him." I am scribing this statement at J.P. car hostpial, Yamunanagar, and the MLR has been submitted, legal action should be taken against Prince Bairagi, Babbu, Rhythm, Gagan and the driver of the Creta car."

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his 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, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, 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 reads as follows:

*"10. vii. The evidence against the petitioner
The petitioner along with co-accused has been seen in a video, while causing injury to the injured Deepak along with co-accused with iron rod and the said video was also made by the co-accused Shareen Bakshi @*

Shanu at the time of occurrence to create fear in the society. The said video was also shown to the injured and after seeing the video, the petitioner also identified the petitioner as assailant.

viii. The role of the petitioner:- The petitioner along with co-accused caused injury to Deepak and broke his legs and arms. The petitioner caused injury to the injured with iron rod.”

REASONING:

8. Allegations against the petitioner are of injuring victim brutally. Both the legs and arms were fractured and petitioner was holding iron rod. Incident was recorded in CCTV. Attack was brutal and pre-planned, as such, no case for bail is made out.

9. The petitioner acted with cruelty which is corroborated with the nature of injuries.

10. [Cruelty] implies there is something inhuman and barbarous -something more than the mere extinguishment of life.¹ The offense is heinous, and the crime brutal. Cruelty is one of the factors in deciding on bail. A cruel person is more likely to create a lot of insecurity in society. Once the courts form a prima facie opinion that the accused acted with cruelty, then such an accused ordinarily should not be granted bail, and if the courts deem it appropriate to grant, then it must be after specifying the reasons for such an indulgence. In the present case, an analysis of the allegations and evidence collected does not warrant the grant of bail to the accused.

11. 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 anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

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

13. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

22.09.2025
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.

¹ In re Kemmler, 136 U.S. at 436 [Refer: Matthew Lippman, Contemporary criminal law: concepts, cases, and controversies, University of Illinois at Chicago, 51, SAGE, California, USA, fourth edition, 2016].