



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-9718-2026

Date of decision: 24.03.2026

PARVEEN @ PARVEEN KUMAR AND ANR.Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG Haryana.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS"), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.404 dated 11.12.2025 under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 126, 333, 351(2), 324(4), 324(5), 109 BNS, registered at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 06.03.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

3. On 06.03.2026, following order had been passed: -

“ Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.404 dated 11.12.2025 registered under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 126, 333, 351(2), 324(4), 324(5) and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.




Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and they have no concern with the said offence. He argued that the alleged occurrence took place on 10.12.2025 at about 10 pm but the FIR in question was registered on 11.12.2025 at 8.35 pm i.e. after a delay of 22 hours, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He argued that petitioner No.1 was not present at the spot but was at his house and draws attention upon CCTV footage to corroborate the same. He further argued that petitioner No.2 had sustained a fracture in his hip due to an earlier accident and is unable to walk and hence, he was not present at the spot. He further argued that the complainant-Sunil Kumar and Manoj Kumar were medically examined at a private hospital, casting doubt on the veracity of the medical evidence. He further argued that even if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioners. He further argued that Section 109 of BNS was added by the prosecution only to make the offence graver. Further, co-accused Rajesh and others have already been granted the concession of interim bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 13.02.2026. Moreover, the petitioners have clean antecedents as they are not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from them. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, she has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioners are serious in nature. She argued that both the petitioners were specifically named in the FIR and actively participated in the crime. However, she has not controverted the fact that the petitioners are first time offenders as they are not involved in any other case.

Adjourned to 24.03.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioners are directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, they shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.



4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Kashmir Singh, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 06.03.2026 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

24.03.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |