



CRM-M-14996-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

112

CRM-M-14996-2026 (O&M)**Decided on: 18.03.2026**

SONU @ KAUSHLENDRA KUMAR VERMAPetitioner
Versus

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.23 dated 15.01.2026 under Sections 115, 3(5), 333, 351(3) of BNS registered at Police Station Palla, District Faridabad, Haryana.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the present case has been registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Binda Lal, alongwith MLR of his son Pankaj Kumar, who had sustained four injuries. Allegedly, on 12.01.2026 at about 2:35 p.m., the complainant was present at his house when he heard noise outside. On coming out, he saw his son, tenant and nephew of neighbour Sanjay arguing with a boy who had parked his scooter in front of their house and thereafter in front of the tenant's shop. When asked to remove the scooter, the boy refused and started using abusive language, upon which the complainant sent his children inside the house.



After some time, Sonu Verma (the present petitioner) alongwith co-accused Sanjay Verma, and another boy came to the spot, abused them and started quarrelling. The complainant went inside his house, but the accused forcibly entered the house, caught hold of his son Pankaj Kumar, gave beatings to him, dragged him outside on the street, threw him on the ground and gave fist and kick blows. On hearing the noise, the complainant raised alarm and people from the locality gathered there, due to which his son was rescued. While leaving the spot, the accused allegedly extended threats to kill them.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that there are no specific allegations against the present petitioner and no role has been attributed to him, thereby causing any injury; he is having clean & clear antecedents; the offences pertaining to the injuries attributed in the present FIR are simple in nature; the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State whereas Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant contended that the present petitioner alongwith co-accused had entered into the house of the complainant and caused injuries to the complainant as well as to the complainant's son.



6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submitted that Section 117 of BNS has been added as, in terms of x-ray conducted on the complainant's son, there is a fracture in the ribs of his chest. He however does not dispute the fact that alleged offences *qua* the present petitioner are triable by the Magistrate and the maximum sentence for the said offences is upto 07 years. He also submitted that the petitioner is having clean & clear antecedents.

6. An oral prayer has been made on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner to add Section 117 of BNS in the head note as well as in the prayer clause of the petition.

7. Prayer so made is accepted and Section 117 of BNS is ordered to be added in the head note as well as in the prayer clause of the petition.

8. Registry is directed to make necessary corrections.

9. Heard.

10. Keeping in view the contentions made by learned counsel for the parties, that the 03 out of 04 injuries are simple in nature and one is stated to be grievous in nature, however, the offences in the present FIR are triable by the Magistrate and the maximum punishment for the alleged offences provided under the relevant provisions of law is 07 years; the petitioner is having clean & clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case except the present case; the petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the petitioner to join the investigation, as



and when required by the Investigating Officer and as the offences in the present case are punishable upto 07 years, the Investigating Officer is directed to follow the directions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar and Another (2014), 8 SCC 273* and *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51*.

11. The present petition stands disposed of.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

18.03.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO