



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

104

CRM-M-27620-2026

Decided on: 15.05.2026

RINKU @ HANSOME**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate with
Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.201 dated 21.07.2018 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 506, 452, 379-B, 323, 149 read with Section 148 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short - 'the IPC'), registered at Police Station Khol, District Rewari.

2. Briefly stated, the complainant, namely, Dharmender got recorded his statement to the effect that at about 03:00 AM, 15-20 young boys while armed with hockey, wicket, sword and knife entered his home, attacked and caused injuries to him on legs, elbow, head and stomach. When an attempt was made by his wife Deepa, in order to rescue him, she was also attacked. His father Birender, who was also



lying on the cot, was also caused injuries. It was further alleged by the complainant that the mobile phone and gold chain of his wife were also snatched by the perpetrators. It is further alleged that they are having property dispute with Rajender and Udaipal, due to which Rajender, along with others has conspired to cause injuries to the complainant-party. Hence the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused; the petitioner was not called to join the investigation for the last 06 years, however, the police is now conducting raids at his house for his arrest; the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation. As such, he prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, put in appearance and accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that that there is a property dispute between the co-accused and the complainant; the co-accused hired the petitioner and others to forcibly dispossess the complainant from the property in dispute. It is further contended that the petitioner along with other assailants entered into the house of the complainant and caused injuries to him and also taken away his mobile phone and gold chain of



his wife; the name of the petitioner figured in the disclosure statement on 08.08.2018 and the petitioner was not available to the police till date and was at large; the petitioner is having criminal antecedents being involved in 06 other cases. As such, he is not entitled to discretionary relief as prayed for.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as that of learned counsel for the State that the petitioner along with other accused formed an unlawful assembly and trespassed the house of the complainant and attacked him with deadly weapons with an intention to dispossess him from the property over which the complainant had a dispute with co-accused; the petitioner is having criminal antecedents, as he is involved in 06 more cases, he is not available to the police for the last 08 years and he is at large, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief and is required for custodial interrogation to know the details of other co-accused. As such, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of discretionary relief as prayed for.

8. In *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than



a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and, therefore, the same is hereby **dismissed**. However, the petitioner can raise all these pleas before the trial Court while seeking regular bail.

10. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

15.05.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO