

205 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC.057490



CRM-M-18623-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

NARESH KUMAR ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (erstwhile Section 438 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No. 36 dated 12.03.2026, under Sections 3(5), 115, 126, 351(2), 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 103(1) & 61(2) of BNS, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 34, 321, 339, 506, 323, 341, 302, 120B IPC) and Sections 25(1-B)(i) and 27 of the Arms Act (Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 103(1), 61(2) of BNS/Sections 323, 341, 302 & 120-B IPC added later on and Sections 25(1-B)(i) and 27 of the Arms Act deleted later on), registered at Police Station Lakhan Majra, District Rohtak.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the FIR has been registered on the complaint of complainant Krishan. He alleges that on 12.03.2026, he was returning from his agricultural fields, Chiri and proceeding to Nandal Road. When he reached near fields of Pyare Lal, a white colored car came there and got stopped the car and three boys got off the car while one boy remained seated on driver seat. The boys who got off the car were holding wooden sticks in their hands and they got blocked his way and gave beatings to him with wooden sticks on hands and legs and he fell down on the spot. Out of those persons, one assailant was identified as Manjeet while the names of remaining three assailants were not known. At the time of causing the injuries, Manjeet asked him to leave the land of

Ramesh, otherwise they will kill him. While going from the spot, he fired a shot in air and told that he is brother of Sanjeet Bidro and he will kill his whole family. Later on, the complainant succumbed to the injuries during the course of medical treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is no incriminating evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the commission of crime.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel and counsel for the complainant have opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the reply by way of affidavit of Tanuj Sharma, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Meham, District Rohtak and the same is taken on record.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the entire facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the specific role attributed to the petitioner is that he was actively involved in criminal conspiracy of the incident and the injuries received by the complainant resulted in his death; the allegations against the petitioner are serious and grave in nature; the investigation is at nascent stage; accordingly, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for thorough and effective investigation of the case. Therefore, considering the seriousness and gravity of the allegations, no exceptional or extraordinary grounds are made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

16.04.2026
Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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