



CRM-M-12527 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

384

CRM-M-12527 of 2026
Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Rohit

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. A.D.S. Jattana, Advocate and
Mr. M.S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

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.737 dated 11.10.2025 registered under Sections 121(1), 132, 191(2&3) and 221 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station City Hansi, District Hansi.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, had obstructed the police officials while discharging their official duties in the process of arresting the co-accused Aaryan and also caused injured to them with iron pipes, gas pipes, kicks and punches. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the



CRM-M-12527 of 2026 **-2-**

petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that multiple false cases have been fabricated in retaliation to the representation dated 24.09.2025 submitted by the petitioner to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Haryana, wherein serious allegations of extortion and corruption were made against SI Satish Kumar, CIA In-charge as he had demanded a sum of Rs.3.25 lakhs to save one Narender and another family member. He argued that raid to arrest some of the named accused was carried out and it is in the said raid, not only the petitioner but his other family members were targeted and beaten up. He further argued that the petitioner had tried to cling onto the e-rickshaw and at not even a single point had attacked the police. He further argued that during this unlawful raid, heinous acts were committed where caste based abuse and humiliation in full public view was carried out against the petitioner, which is a cognizable offence under the SC/ST Act. 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 10.12.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner has



CRM-M-12527 of 2026 **-3-**

been specifically named in the FIR. He further argued that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons had committed a serious offence of attacking the police party and obstructing them while discharging their official duties i.e. while arresting co-accused Aryan. He further argued that the present petitioner along with others had scuffled with the police team and had tried to redeem co-accused Aryan from being arrested by the police team. He further submitted that petitioner's bail in another FIR was also dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. He submitted that the present petitioner along with other co-accused are clearly visible in CCTV footage showing the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. He further argued that the petitioner is also involved in one more case meaning thereby he is a habitual offender. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation in the matter, to recover the weapon of offence and identification and arrest of co-accused. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and specific, and he has been duly named in the FIR. The material placed on record, including CCTV footage, prima facie indicates the active involvement of the petitioner in obstructing the police party in the discharge of their official duties and in attempting to rescue a co-accused from lawful custody. The contention regarding false implication, at this stage, cannot be conclusively adjudicated upon. Furthermore, the petitioner is stated to be involved in other criminal cases, and his custodial interrogation appears



CRM-M-12527 of 2026 -4-

necessary for a fair and effective investigation. 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 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.

7. 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 disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

8. 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.
9. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

06.04.2026

D.Bansal

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No