



CRM-M-11743 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-11743 of 2026
Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

Narender @ Narender Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Rahul Sidher, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

None for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.482 dated 18.12.2025 registered under Sections 115, 117(2), 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 110 of the BNS added later on), at Police Station Agroha, District Hisar.

2. Brief facts as per the case of the prosecution are that the petitioner along with co-accused attacked and caused injuries to the complainant. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the alleged occurrence took place on 16.12.2025 but the FIR in question was



CRM-M-11743 of 2026 **-2-**

registered on 18.12.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 02 days, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any concern with the said offence. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused Satpal. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioners with the offence in question. He argued that during investigation, main accused Ashish had been found innocent, which clearly demonstrates the version of the complainant to be unreliable. He argued that even if the prosecution version is believed to be true, even then no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner. He further argued that Section 117(2) of BNS has been added by the prosecution, only to make the offence graver. Further, co-accused Satpal has already been directed to join investigation by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 25.02.2026. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide order dated 10.02.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for



CRM-M-11743 of 2026 **-3-**

grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the supplementary statement of Jagdish and also in the disclosure statement of co-accused Satpal. He further argued that the petitioner is one of the main accused who in connivance with other unknown accused person, attacked the complainant and caused serious injuries to him. He further submitted that the injuries No.1, 2, 3 and 5 have been declared grievous in nature. He further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation in the matter, to ascertain the involvement of other co-accused in the matter, to recover the weapon of offence as well as the car used in the crime. He further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby he is a habitual offender. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the supplementary statement of Jagdish as well as in the disclosure statement of co-accused Satpal and the allegations against him are specific and serious in nature. The petitioner is the main accused and is alleged to have inflicted serious injuries upon the complainant due to previous enmity and injuries No.1, 2, 3 & 5 have been declared grievous in nature. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such



CRM-M-11743 of 2026 -4-

allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wider impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of



CRM-M-11743 of 2026 **-5-**

disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

10. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

01.04.2026
D.Bansal

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No