



226

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-19674-2026
Decided on : 17.04.2026

Dilbag

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ashwani Kumar Saini, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Vijaraniya, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Dilbag, aged about 39 years	71	05.03.2026	109(1), 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 103(1) & 238 of BNS, 2023 [Corresponding Sections 307, 147, 148, 323, 341, 506, 302, 201 of IPC]	Kalanaur	Rohtak

2. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed reply dated 16.04.2026 by way of affidavit of Rakesh Kumar, HPS, DSP, Sampla, District Rohtak, on behalf of the respondent – State, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the



petitioner.

3. In the present case, on 10.04.2026, following order was passed:-

“2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that in the initial version of the FIR, name of the petitioner has not been mentioned.*

3. *Notice of motion.*

4. *On advance notice, Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and submits that there are total 27 accused in the present case, and Vikram @ Kallu (deceased) suffered total 7 injuries, and there were two more injured in the present case, including him. Total 14 injuries were suffered by the deceased and the injured persons. However, he prays for grant of some time to file status report in the matter.*

5. *Adjourned to 17.04.2026.*

6. *Let status report be filed by learned State counsel, highlighting therein role assigned to the petitioner, nature of injuries and medical report of the injured persons, on or before the next date of hearing.”*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the initial version of the FIR, name of the petitioner does not figure. It was only on the next day of the incident, i.e. 05.03.2026, that an application was moved by injured Ashok, wherein names of around 28 accused persons were mentioned, without assigning any specific role to anybody or disclosing details regarding the weapon(s), if any, carried by any particular accused. There are total 28/29 accused in the case, and the deceased Vikram @ Kallu suffered total 07 injuries.

Further contends that no specific attribution has been alleged against the petitioner even in the status report filed today by learned State counsel. In the said status report, it has been mentioned that the petitioner caused injuries to the complainant party with a wooden stick, but there is no



clarification as to whom such injury was caused or on which part of the body the said injury was inflicted. Reliance has also been placed upon the written complaint of injured Ashok, wherein there is no mention of any specific injury having been caused by the petitioner-Dilbag, though the incident had taken place on 04.03.2026.

Thus, it is argued that in the given circumstances, petitioner should not be subjected to custodial interrogation, and he is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant jointly oppose the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submit that the petitioner has been specifically named during the course of investigation and has been attributed active participation in the occurrence. It is contended that the petitioner was part of the unlawful assembly, armed with a wooden stick, and had caused injuries to the complainant party.

There are specific allegations regarding the participation of the accused persons, including the petitioner, and the investigation is still at a crucial stage. In case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage, it may adversely affect the investigation and there is every likelihood of his influencing witnesses or tampering with prosecution evidence. Accordingly, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the status report filed by learned State counsel.



7. This Court notices that the name of the petitioner does not figure in the initial version of the FIR and came to be introduced subsequently in the application moved by injured Ashok. There are allegations against a large number of accused persons and no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner either in the said application or in the status report, except a general allegation that he had caused injuries with a wooden stick. State has also not been able to point out as to whom such injury was caused or on which part of the body the same was inflicted.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegations, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.



10. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 17, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/~~No~~*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/~~No~~*