



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

203

Date of Decision: 02.04.2026.

**(1) CRM-M-4902-2026**

Ravi Kumar

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

**WITH****(2) CRM-M-4911-2026**

Abhishek

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

**AND****(3) CRM-M-6814-2026**

Suman and others

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

\*\*\*

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

---

**Present:** Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate and  
Mr. Shamsher Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amish Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Sharda, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner-Ravi Kumar (in CRM-M-4902-2026), petitioner-Abhishek (in CRM-M-4911-2026) and petitioners namely Suman, Kamlesh, Vikram and Ajay Kumar (in CRM-M-6814-2026), have filed the aforementioned three petitions under Section 482 BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.07 dated 07.01.2026 under Sections 118, 190, 191(3), 333, 351(2) BNS, registered at Police Station Kunjpura, District Karnal.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, on 29.01.2026, the following order was passed by this Court in CRM-M-4902-2026 and CRM-M-4911-2026:-

*“1. Present petitions have been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-*

| <b>Name of petitioner(s)</b> | <b>FIR No.</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Section(s)</b>                  | <b>Police Station</b> | <b>District</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Ravi Kumar Abhishek          | 07             | 07.01.2026  | 118,190,191(3), 333, 351(2) of BNS | Kunjpura              | Karnal          |

*2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, as per the FIR, petitioner-Ravi Kumar allegedly delivered a blow to the head of the injured, Rohit, with an axe. According to the MLR, Rohit sustained a total of five injuries; however, the injury on the head is described as a laceration with irregular margins. Further, there is no medical opinion classifying the injury as grievous, serious, or life-threatening.*

*Similarly, while arguing the plea for anticipatory bail for accused-Abhishek, it is submitted that he allegedly delivered an axe blow to Rohit’s shoulder. Rohit suffered a total of five injuries, of which Injury No. 3 is recorded on the shoulder as a contused lacerated wound with regular margins. Regarding this injury as well, there is no medical opinion stating that it was serious, grievous, or dangerous to life.*

*Learned counsel further argued that concerning the same incident, which occurred on 05.01.2026, a cross-case has also been registered by petitioner party at the instance of Kamlesh Devi w/o Sheesh Pal. Both petitioners, Ravi and Abhishek, have also suffered injuries, and the relevant MLRs have been appended to the petition. Counsel submits that, in view of these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary. Moreover, petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation if they are protected from arrest.*

*In view of the above, learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.*

3. Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State.

*He seeks some time to file reply.*

4. *Adjourned to 02.04.2026.*

5. *Let status report be filed detailing the nature of injuries suffered by the victims, specifically indicating which injuries, if any, were caused by the petitioners herein.*

6. *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioners shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioners joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.*

7. *A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.”*

3. Similarly, on 05.02.2026, following order was passed by this Court in CRM-M-6814-2026:-

*“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-*

| <i>Name &amp; age of petitioner(s)</i>                                                                                               | <i>FIR No.</i> | <i>Date</i>       | <i>Section(s)</i>                                       | <i>Police Station</i> | <i>District</i> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| <i>1. Suman (aged 45 years);<br/>II. Kamlesh (aged 48 years),<br/>III. Vikram (aged 26 years)<br/>IV. Ajay Kumar (aged 28 years)</i> | <i>0007</i>    | <i>07.01.2026</i> | <i>118,190,191(3),<br/>333, 351(2) of<br/>BNS, 2023</i> | <i>Kunjpur<br/>a</i>  | <i>Karnal</i>   |

2. *As per allegations against the petitioners, petitioners No.1 & 2, namely, Suman & Kamlesh, gave stick blow to the injured Mohit, and petitioners No.3 & 4, namely, Vikram & Ajay Kumar, gave stick blow to injured Rohit.*

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that concerning the same incident, which occurred on 05.01.2026, a cross-case has also been registered by petitioner party at the instance of Kamlesh (petitioner herein). Co-accused of the petitioners, namely, Ravi and Abhishek, have also suffered injuries, and the relevant MLRs have been appended to the petition.*

*Besides, learned counsel refers to the order dated 29.01.2026, passed by this Court in the anticipatory bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-4902-2026 & connected case (Annexure P-10),*

*filed by co-accused, namely, Ravi Kumar and Abhishek. Therefore, learned counsel submits that in view of these circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary. Moreover, petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation if they are protected from arrest.*

*Therefore, he prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

3. *Notice of motion.*

4. *On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report by verifying the submissions addressed by the petitioner’s counsel.*

5. *Adjourned to 02.04.2026.*

6. *At this stage, Mr. Vishal Sharda, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and files his memo of appearance. He undertakes to file his Vakatanama in the registry in due course of time.*

7. *Let status report be filed detailing therein the nature of injuries suffered by the victims, specially indicating which injuries, if any, were caused by the petitioners herein.*

8. *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioners shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioners joining investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.*

9. *To be heard along with CRM-M-4902-2026.”*

4. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that none of the injuries assigned to the petitioner(s) in all the three petitions were found grievous, serious or of the nature of ‘dangerous to life’. There are certain injuries sustained by the members of the petitioners’ party also. He further submits that, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not serve any purpose as all the petitioners are ready to join investigation and fully cooperate with the Investigating Agency, if protected from arrest.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for complainant-Kamlesh Devi, opposes the prayer for

anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s) and submits that active involvement of the petitioner(s) is found to be there during investigation. Even the alleged cross-version, got registered at the instance of the petitioners' party is found to be false and the same has been cancelled.

6. Responding over the contention of the State and the complainant, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that conduct of the Investigating Officer even does not seem to be fair, because, Investigating Officer himself/herself cannot decide and cancel the cross-version. Once injuries have been sustained by the petitioners' party also, (accused party in the present cases), it was to be left for the trial Court only, for adjudication as to which party is the aggressor one.

7. Be that as it may, considering all the aforementioned facts and circumstances, role assigned to each of the accused and there being admitted position that none of the injuries attributed to the petitioner(s) in all these three petitions, is found to be serious, grievous and of the nature of 'dangerous to life' by the doctor concerned, this Court does not find any substantial reason for subjecting the petitioner(s) to custodial interrogation.

8. Accordingly, all the three petitions are **allowed** and the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioner(s) shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

9. Besides, petitioner(s) would submit/surrender their passports before the Arresting Officer and an undertaking on oath that in case of leaving

the Country, they would seek prior permission from the concerned Court.

10. However, it is made clear that if any repeated incident of involvement of the petitioner(s) or the members of their party, to misuse the concession of the bail, is found, then this Court would be constrained to take harsh view if the prosecution or the complainant files any application for cancellation of bail.

11. **Petitions stand disposed of accordingly.**

12. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected files.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**02.04.2026**

*jitender*

|                            |   |         |
|----------------------------|---|---------|
| Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes/ No |
| Whether Reportable         | : | Yes/ No |