

2026.PHHC.059897



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17163-2026

Prince
...Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana and another
...Respondents

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	20.04.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	21.04.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	21.04.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sarun Hans, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 52 dated 29.01.2026 registered under Sections 110, 115, 118(1) 126, 351(3) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNS’) at Police Station Barwala,

2026.PHHC.059897



District Hisar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Ajay, alleging therein that on 28.01.2026, he along with his friend Harish and Kuljeet had gone to play in the playground Barwala and while they were coming back and when they reached near Nandi Gaushala Banbhauri Road, they were intercepted by the present petitioner, who was accompanied by the co-accused Sanam and Aryan. Accused wrongfully confined their way and started hurling abuses to his friend Kuljeet and also beating him. The complainant tried to rescue his friend and then the accused Aryan caught hold of him, the petitioner and accused Sanam extended beatings to him and the petitioner struck blows with a knife on his head and neck, whereas accused Sanam struck blows with knife on his back and spine. They also assaulted his friends Kuljeet and Harsh. On clamour being raised, several persons had reached at the spot and then the assailants fled away. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, which was dismissed vide order dated 13.03.2026.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The injuries that have been sustained by the complainant have been opined to be simple in nature. He has clean antecedents. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, thus, argued that

2026.PHHC.059897



the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant-respondent No.2 and has filed his *vakalatnama*. It is denied that any compromise has been effected between the parties.

5. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for respondent No.2 has argued that the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused had voluntarily caused injuries on the person of the complainant by using knife. The allegations against him are serious in nature. The victim had suffered incised wounds as well as lacerated wounds on his person. Simply because the injuries have not been opined to be grievous in nature, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have voluntarily caused injuries by using knife on the person of the complainant and his friends. The injuries sustained by the complainant have been opined to be simple in nature. Given the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the nature of the injuries sustained by the victim and the attendant facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and as such, no case for pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed.

2026.PHHC.059897



The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer to join investigation within 10 days and subsequent also as and when required. In the event of his arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on interim bail on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

7. It is further clarified that the observations made above are only for the purpose of consideration of application for pre-arrest bail and the same shall not in any manner influence the trial. The trial Court shall consider the case on its merits and without being influenced by this order.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application if any is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

21st April, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |