



CRM-M-13736-2026

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.110

CRM-M-13736-2026
Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

HIMANSHU YADAV

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Kartar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. (now Section 482 of BNSS, 2023) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 32 dated 19.02.2026, registered under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 190, 192(3), 109 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 323, 325, 149, 153, 307 and 506 of IPC) at Police Station Sarai Khwaja, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 18.02.2026, information was received from ERV-197 that a fight had taken place in Sector-27C and the injured Vikas had been admitted to B.K. Hospital for treatment. The doctor examined the injured and noted a lacerated wound on the right side of the forehead with swelling, after which he was referred to AIIMS Trauma Centre for further treatment. Thereafter, a written complaint was submitted by Smt. Kumkum, wife of Birender, stating that on 17.02.2026 her son Sunny had received a phone call informing that Gore, Ankit and others were



beating his maternal uncle Munna Singh. It was alleged that the accused believed that Sunny had abused them. On the next day i.e. 18.02.2026 at about 4:00 PM, it was reported by her tenant Vinod Mishra that Ankit, Ajay, Matru, Pudki, Brijesh and others had attacked him near Panorama Company. It was further alleged that the assailants later reached their house and assaulted Vikas and Sunny with sticks and bats, causing severe injuries on the head of Vikas. It was also alleged that Ankit was armed with an iron *daav*, which was allegedly snatched by Sunny in self-defence, after which all the assailants fled from the spot. The present FIR came to be registered on the basis of the said allegations.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the allegations levelled in the FIR are highly exaggerated and do not reflect the true facts of the incident. It is submitted that the occurrence in question was in fact a case of a cross-fight between two groups in which persons from both sides sustained injuries. It is argued that the complainant party has deliberately concealed the injuries suffered by Ankit in order to falsely project the petitioner as the aggressor. It is further contended that Ankit was not carrying any iron *daav* as alleged in the FIR and rather Sunny had come armed with an iron *daav* and had inflicted a blow on the head of Ankit. Learned counsel further submits that video-graphic evidence is available with the petitioner which shows Sunny running towards the petitioner while holding the iron *daav* in his hand and the same shall be produced at the time of hearing. It is also submitted that one of the persons from the accused side namely Ankit had also sustained injuries in the said occurrence, which clearly demonstrates that the incident was a sudden altercation and the



question as to who was the aggressor can only be determined during trial. It is further contended that the FIR has been registered with delay as the alleged incident took place on 18.02.2026 at about 4:00 PM whereas the FIR was registered on 19.02.2026 at about 9:00 PM, which indicates that the complainant party had sufficient time to deliberate and fabricate a story to falsely implicate the petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that the allegations in the FIR are omnibus in nature and there is no independent evidence to substantiate the same.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is the main accused who had inflicted injuries upon the injured with sticks and bats and the nature of injuries suffered by the victim is also serious. It is further contended that recovery of the weapon of offence i.e. danda/lathi used during the occurrence is yet to be effected from the petitioner and therefore his custodial interrogation is necessary for proper investigation of the case.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court finds that the allegations levelled in the FIR disclose the commission of a serious offence. The injury report of the injured Vikas reveals that one of the injuries suffered by him has been declared as dangerous to life, which was inflicted on a vital part of the body i.e. the head. In such circumstances, the ingredients of the offence under Section 307 IPC / Section 109 of the BNS are *prima facie* attracted. The nature and gravity of the injuries suffered by the victim indicate the seriousness of the occurrence and cannot be brushed aside at this stage.



CRM-M-13736-2026 4

6. Furthermore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for effective investigation of the case, particularly for the purpose of recovery of the weapon of offence and to ascertain the complete sequence of events. Considering the serious nature of allegations, the gravity of the offence and the nature of injuries suffered by the victim, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.
7. Consequently, the present petition seeking anticipatory bail is dismissed.
8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

12.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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