

S. No.217

2025:PHHC:166685



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54245 of 2025

Date of Decision:01.12.2025

Amit Rawat

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Petitioner

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present:- Mr. D.P. Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Raj Kumar.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.236, dated 11.08.2025, registered at Police Station Sadar Ballabgarh, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115, 118(1), 3(5) and 351(2) of BNSS, 2023 (Section 118(2) of BNSS, 2023 has been added later on).

2. On 01.10.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.236, dated 11.08.2025, registered at Police Station Sadar Ballabgarh, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115, 118(1), 3(5) and 351(2) of BNSS, 2023 (Section 118(2) of BNSS, 2023 has been added later on).

2. Short report by way of affidavit dated 30.09.2025 of Varun Kumar Dahiya, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Crime-II, Faridabad filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. Both the parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.

4. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Manoj son of Het Lal with the allegations that yesterday on 10.08.2025, he was sleeping in his house. At about 10:00 PM, he heard noise of a quarrel on which he came out of the house and saw that Prahlad, Saurav son of Prahlad, Amit son of Prahlad and Gautam son of Krishan were causing injuries to his cousins Bobby and Dinesh. When he went to their rescue, Prahlad proclaimed that Manoj should also be



killed and they started beating him. Gautam gave a blow towards him with a sword and in order to save himself, he warded off the blow with his left hand and the sword hit his left wrist which got fractured. Thereafter, his neighbours took him to the hospital for treatment.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No injury is attributed to petitioner Amit and even as per FIR, they were causing injuries to Bobby and Dinesh when victim allegedly intervened and one blow was given by accused Gautam. Learned counsel next contended that nothing is to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. He is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that all the accused were causing injuries to Bobby and Dinesh and when victim intervened, co-accused Gautam attacked him with a sword resulting in grievous injury in his left writ. The offence in question has been committed by all the accused in furtherance of their common intention. The sword is yet to be recovered and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential and in view of gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Adjourned to **01.12.2025** for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court; iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.

3. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 01.10.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 01.10.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.



However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

- 5. Disposed of.
- 6. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

December 01, 2025
renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No