



CRM-M-17089-2026

-1-

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

103

CRM-M-17089-2026

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

JATIN

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Munish Behl, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.55 dated 14.02.2026, registered under Sections 110, 115, 190, 191(3), 324(2), 333 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 308, 323, 149, 148, 426, 452 & 506 IPC), registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 13.02.2026 at about 10:00 PM, the petitioner along with 4-5 boys forcibly entered the shop of the complainant and caused injuries to the complainant and his brother-Sanjeev with a weapon made of iron. It is also alleged that the assailants damaged the shop by breaking its glass, took away mobile phone of the complainant and extended threats to kill him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any

**CRM-M-17089-2026****-2-**

offence. It is submitted that only simple injuries have been attributed to the petitioner as well as the co-accused and no sharp-edged weapon was used. It is further submitted that the alleged occurrence took place in a shop situated at a public place, and therefore, the offence under Section 333 of BNS is not attracted. He also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana assisted by SI Ram Singh, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State and vehemently opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is involved in three other criminal cases, the injuries attributed to him are grievous in nature and the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. She, therefore, submits that this petition be dismissed as the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for proper and effective investigation.

6. Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed the Vakalatnama in Court, which is taken on record. He also opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner as he inflicted injuries with an iron weapon on the head of the complainant, Vikram, as well as on the right eye of Sanjeev Kumar, the complainant's brother.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material available on record.

8. As per the version of the FIR, the petitioner, being a member of an unlawful assembly, entered the shop of the complainant at about 10:00 PM and



CRM-M-17089-2026

-3-

caused injuries on the head of the complainant as well as his brother with a sharp-edged iron weapon, which *prima facie* shows the gravity of the offence.

8. Moreover, the investigation is still in progress and the weapon used in the offence has not yet been recovered. In such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is considered necessary.

9. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner and his involvement in three other criminal cases, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

10. Consequently, the petition is, hereby, dismissed.

11. However, it is clarified that the observations made hereinabove would not have any bearing on the merits of the case.

30.03.2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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