



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

CRM-M-19629-2026
Date of decision: 17.04.2026

SURESH CHAND

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

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

Present: Mr. S.S.Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS (Section 438 of Cr.P.C) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 358 dated 07.12.2025 under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 126(2), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS, 2023/ 307, 323, 341, 149, 148 and 506 of IPC registered at Police Station City Sadar Jhajjar and District Jhajjar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, allegedly gave beatings to Amit and Rajbir with a lathi, danda, and jelly. When the complainant tried to intervene and save Amit and Rajbir, Rekha, wife of Pammi, allegedly inflicted a brick blow on his right ear, and all the assailants thereafter gave kicks and fist blows to the complainant. Subsequently, upon receipt of the medical opinion regarding the nature of injuries on the person of Amit, the offence under Section 109(1) of the BNS was added in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner



was named only after three days after the injured was discharged from the hospital. He further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant. They have vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature.
6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.
7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations against the petitioner, and the fact that the petitioner allegedly caught hold of the injured while his co-accused inflicted injuries, which resulted in the injured being paralyzed, this Court is of the view that no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances are made out to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

17.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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