



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

255

CRM-M-63356-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.11.2025

Aryan @Aryan Lot

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Wazir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 190, 191(3), 351(2) and 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the FIR No.403 dated 22.10.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Taraori, District Karnal. Since the petitioner is apprehending arrest in the abovementioned case, and his application for anticipatory bail has been dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge Karnal, vide order dated 01.11.2025, the petitioner is seeking for anticipatory bail, by virtue of present petition. The petitioner is claiming the abovesaid concession by invoking the provisions enshrined under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the abovementioned FIR came into being on the statement of Kulwinder Singh, who stated that on 22.10.2025 at about 12:30 pm, his son Anurag was called by Aryan S/o Tejender at the bus-stand of Village Bhaini Kalan, and when



his son Anurag reached the bus-stand, Aryan called 15-20 boys, who launched an attack upon Anurag, and inflicted injury on his person, due to which Anurag lost conscious. It is the claim of the complainant that thereafter, Abhishek R/o Village Bhaini Kalan got Anurag admitted in Taraori Hospital, and subsequently, the information was given to the police. According to complainant, the names of other assailants including the petitioner were Rohit, Harsh, Jatin, Nonu, Lalit, and Rajat Heran.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation, two accused, namely Harsh and Jatin were arrested, whereas the petitioner is still at large. It has been alleged by the prosecution that medico-legal examination of injured Anurag was conducted, and in the medico-legal examination, two injuries were found on the person of injured Anurag.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed status report. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, and in fact the petitioner had never called the injured on the day of incident. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, only two injuries have been found on the person of injured Anurag, and there is no specific allegations against the petitioner that the injuries on the person of injured Anurag were inflicted by the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended



that the injury, caused by sharp-edged weapon, has been attributed to the co-accused Harsh, who has already been arrested and enlarged on bail.

7. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner. As per learned State Counsel, the petitioner is the main accused in the present case, and that he was the one, who was instrumental in calling other persons, and provoking them to inflict injuries on the person of injured Anurag. While claiming that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case, the learned State Counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for arriving at any decision with regard to present petition for bail: -

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that maximum punishment prescribed for the abovementioned offence is imprisonment upto 07 years;
- iii) that the injury, inflicted with the help of sharp-edged weapon, has not been attributed to the petitioner;
- iv) that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner;
- v) that as per learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- vi) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vii) that investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- viii) that detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose; and



- ix) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result.
- x) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on anticipatory bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- xi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation/trial.

10. As already observed above, the denial of permission of custodial interrogation of the petitioner, to the investigating agency, will not cause any harm to the process of investigation in the present case, and therefore, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, it is hereby held that the present petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the petitioner is hereby held entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to the following conditions:

- i) that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency;
- ii) that he will not left the country without prior permission of the Court;
- iii) that he will not influence the witness or interfere in the process of collection of evidence by the investigating agency; and
- iv) that he will abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

11. In terms of abovementioned conditions, the present petition stands **allowed**, accordingly, with a direction that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/trial Court.



12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 14, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No