



201

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

**CRM-M-24250-2026
DECIDED ON: 29.05.2026**

SAMEER KHAN**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana, assisted by
ASI Ravi Shankar.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.137, dated 27.03.2025, under Sections 103(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (corresponding to sections 302, 148, 149 of IPC) and section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.
2. Primary contention raised by counsel for the petitioner is that the deceased suffered only two stab injuries and the same have been attributed to the main accused, namely Himanshu. Petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been implicated only on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Koshlender, who alleged that the petitioner, along with other co-accused, had reached the spot in a Baleno car, and all of them had mercilessly beaten the deceased.
3. Status report dated 07.05.2026, already appended with the present petition, reveals that as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Koshlender alias Ballu, he was accompanied by the petitioner-Sameer Khan, Gaurav Pandit, Ujjwal, Prince and Aashish Padda. At the instance of accused Koshlender @ Ballu, one knife used in the commission of the crime was also recovered.

Further, it has been explained in the status report that all the accused had reached the site of the incident in a Baleno car, and the said car was allegedly being driven by the petitioner. After commission of the crime, it was the petitioner who allegedly drove all the accused away from the spot in the same vehicle.

4. At this stage, learned State counsel, upon instructions, submits that petitioner has been avoiding joining the investigation for more than one year and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for recovery of the Baleno car.

5. Considering the nature of the allegations in their entirety, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. **Consequently, present petition is dismissed.**

6. However, Commissioner of Police, Faridabad, is directed to look into the aspect, as to why the Investigating Officer failed to take necessary steps for more than one year to secure the arrest of the petitioner.

7. Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the Commissioner of Police, Faridabad, through the State.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>