



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

111

CRM-M-70441-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 15.12.2025

Sahil ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (482 of BNSS, 2023), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.293 dated 21.09.2025, registered under Sections 115, 140(3), 190, 191(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 310 (2) of BNS was added later on), at Police Station Saran, District Faridabad.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as there is no specific allegation against him and no injury is attributed to him. Neither any motive nor previous enmity is there between the parties. It is further contended that co-accused Lalit and Robin have already been granted anticipatory bail by the trial Court. Learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as he is ready and willing to join the investigation.
3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-70441-2025 (O&M)

(2)

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State, and opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature that he had kidnapped the complainant along with his friends, gave him beatings, hung him upside down in a well and snatched amount of Rs.5000/-. His name is specifically mentioned in the FIR. There is a video footage recorded by Parvinder, friend of the complainant, which establishes the presence of petitioner with co-accused and the complainant. Bail application of similarly placed co-accused Himanshu has been dismissed on merits by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide order dated 17.11.2025. Thus, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view of contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties; the fact that the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature that he had kidnapped the complainant along with his friends, gave him beatings, hung him upside down in a well and snatched amount of Rs.5000/-; his name is specifically mentioned in the FIR; and there is a video footage establishing presence of the petitioner at the scene of occurrence, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition seeking anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806**' decided on 03.08.1997, by holding that many useful



CRM-M-70441-2025 (O&M) (3)

informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

15.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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