

CRM-M-26304-2026
Date of decision: 11.05.2026

...PETITIONER

...RESPONDENT

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

2. Briefly stated, allegations against the petitioner are that he was a part of an unlawful assembly, which attacked upon the complainant and gave him beatings with sticks, axes and bricks. Petitioner has been nominated as accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, namely, Rohit Raghav.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

- i. The petitioner has been involved in the present case only on the basis of statement made by co-accused, namely, Rohit Raghav, which is inadmissible in evidence;
- ii. Except the disclosure statement made by co-accused, there is nothing on record to show the complicity of the petitioner;
- iii. No specific role or injury has been attributed to the petitioner;
- iv. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation as and when required and to co-operate with the investigating agency; and
- v. Petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioner on the following aspects:

- i. Petitioner has actively participated in the commission of offence;
- ii. Petitioner along with co-accused, in a pre-planned manner, attacked the complainant and caused him grievous injuries; and
- iii. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of weapon of offence and for vehicle used in the commission of offence.



5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties, this Court does not find merit in the present petition on the following grounds:

- i. Petitioner has actively participated in the commission of offence;
- ii. Petitioner along with co-accused, formed an unlawful assembly and in a pre-planned manner, attacked the complainant and caused him grievous injuries;
- iii. The manner, in which, the offence has been committed and the nature of offence; and
- iv. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of weapon of offence and for vehicle, which was used in the commission of offence.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806' decided on 03.08.1997***, has emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, rather than from a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. So, taking into consideration the totality of circumstances and the manner, in which, the offence was committed, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands **dismissed**.



9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The trial court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

May 11, 2026
Manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No