



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

**CRM-M No.25472 of 2026
Date of decision: 13.05.2026**

Jai Parkash @ Leela Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. L.K. Gollen, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for
grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.22 dated
31.01.2026 registered under Sections 109(1), 115, 190, 191(3), 333, 351(3)
BNS (corresponding Sections 307, 323, 149, 148, 452, 506 IPC) at Police
Station Rohtak Sadar, District Rohtak.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the complaint
of Vikas Beniwal, who alleged that on 26.01.2026, his sons had gone to their
another house situated on Ladhaut-Bhaiyapur Road. At that time, one
Mandeep, in an intoxicated condition, hit the complainant's parked car with



his motorcycle, resulting in a quarrel and physical altercation between both sides. Thereafter, both parties approached the village elders in an attempt to amicably resolve the dispute through a panchayat. Consequently, on 30.01.2026, a meeting was convened at the residence of former Sarpanch Kartar Singh in the presence of other respectable members of the village to settle the matter. However, during the course of the meeting, altercations allegedly took place and threats were extended. It is further alleged that later on the same day, about 25–30 persons, including Sandeep, Parveen and their family members, entered the complainant's house armed with sharp-edged weapons and sticks. It is also alleged that the assailants attacked the complainant and inflicted multiple injuries upon him before fleeing from the spot under the impression that he had died. The complainant also alleged that threats were extended to him and his family members during the occurrence. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that as per the prosecution case itself, the occurrence arose out of a sudden quarrel after one Mandeep, allegedly in an intoxicated condition, hit a parked vehicle, which led to an altercation between both the parties. It is argued that the incident was neither pre-planned nor premeditated and even a Panchayat was convened between the parties in the presence of respectable persons, which clearly shows that the matter was personal in nature and capable of amicable settlement. It has further been contended that a bare perusal of the FIR would show that the specific allegations of causing injuries are attributed to co-accused Sandeep and Parveen, who were allegedly armed with weapons,



whereas no specific role or overt act has been attributed to the present petitioner in causing any injury to the complainant party. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated on the basis of vague and general allegations without any material showing his active participation or sharing of common intention in the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the entire prosecution story itself reveals that the dispute originated from a trivial incident and the subsequent escalation in allegations appears to be an afterthought with an intention to falsely implicate the petitioner and his family members. It is submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are merely derivative in nature based upon alleged instigation and there is no supporting material to show that he participated in the execution of the alleged offence in any manner.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the status report by way of the affidavit of Mr. Gulab Singh, H.P.S., Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rohtak, which is taken on the record and he has vehemently opposed the present petition and argued that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It has been contended that the petitioner was one of the members of the unlawful assembly and was accompanying the main accused namely Sandeep and Parveen. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner, along with the co-accused armed with sharp-edged weapons and sticks, forcibly entered the house of the complainant and caused multiple injuries to the injured. It has further been argued that the role of the petitioner is not merely passive in nature and he actively participated in the occurrence along with the other accused persons.



Learned State counsel has further submitted that the nature of injuries suffered by the injured clearly reflects the brutality of the attack. As per the MLR, the injured suffered four stitches on the head, stitches on both legs, fractures in the spine, fracture in the leg and fracture in the hand. It is argued that the injured remained hospitalized and bedridden due to the grievous injuries inflicted upon him. Learned State counsel also submits that keeping in view the gravity of allegations, the manner in which the occurrence took place and the serious injuries caused to the injured, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Keeping in view the seriousness of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the nature and gravity of injuries suffered by the injured and the fact that the petitioner was allegedly a member of the unlawful assembly along with the principal accused persons, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Though no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioner, however, *prima-facie*, he was part of the unlawful assembly which allegedly entered the house of the complainant armed with weapons and caused multiple grievous injuries to the injured. The injuries suffered by the injured, including fractures in the spine, leg and hand, indicate the seriousness of the occurrence. In such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner cannot be ruled out at this stage.

7. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.



8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.
9. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

13.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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