

CRM-M-54540-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54540-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 29.10.2025

Manoj alias Manoj Pahal ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Nitin Sansanwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Birender Bikram Attray, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
167	06.07.2025	HSIIDC, Barhi, District Sonapat	110, 115(2), 324(4), 351(3), 3(5) BNS 2023

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 15 of the bail petition, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	225	25.06.2018	396, 397 IPC	Murthal
2	314	19.07.2018	115, 120B, 34 IPC	Rai
3	330	25.10.2022	148, 149, 279, 323, 336, 341 & 506 IPC	Barhi

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“That the brief facts of the case are that on 05.07.2025 information received at Police Station that there was a fight in front of the liquor shop on Ganaur Flyover G.T. Road. On the information investigating officer reached at the spot but no one was found present there. Further on 06.07.2025 information received from CHC Ganaur about Sarthak son of

CRM-M-54540-2025

Navdeep injured in a fight and admitted for treatment. After that investigating officer reached at CHC Ganaur and copy of MLR No. MO/44/GNR/2025 dated 05.07.2025 was obtained in which the medical officer has written about two injuries and advise Opthal opinion, Advise NCCT Head and surgery opinion and injured person had referred to BPS Khanpur. Copy of MLR is annexed herewith as Annexure R-1. After that injured was contacted over the phone and he told that he was getting his treatment privately and would submitted his complaint. Further the injured presented his written complaint alleging therein that he is dealing scrap in Barhi factory and on 04.07.2025 he went to factory in his Scorpio No.HR-13W-5660. At about 11.30 PM he went to liquor vend at Ganaur Flyover in his car and after parking his car he went to take bear from liquor vend. When he came back to his car, one boy quarrelled with him and called his two friends. He was pulled from his car and they snatched away his golden chain and gave bitta, kick and fist blows to him. They also caused considerable damage to his car. They were calling each other with the names of Parveen, Manoj and Bachhi. They fled in his car HR 42H-0602 threatening him to kill. Accordingly, complainant prayed for taking legal action against the accused persons.”

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 their family. Counsel further 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.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“9. That role of the petitioner in this case is that the petitioner alongwith co accused dragged the complainant by holding his caller from his car and snatched away his golden chain and In the CCTV footage the gave severe beatings to him. petitioner and co accused are clearly seen fighting with the complainant. The petitioner has been implicated by name. The weapons/Belt used in the commission of offence is to be recovered from his

CRM-M-54540-2025

possession. As such custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present case.”

REASONING:

7. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, petitioner has criminal antecedents and is involved in three more cases. Recovery of gold chain is pending and considering the previous criminal history and injuries attributed no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

8. 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.

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

10. **Petition dismissed.** Interim orders are recalled with immediate effect. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.10.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.