

2026:PHHC:087176



103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32676-2026(O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

MANSHU

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023/438 of Cr.P.C, 1973 with a prayer for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 163 dated 12.03.2026 (Annexure P-1) under sections 110, 115, 190, 191(3), 333, 351(3) and 117(2) of Bhartiya Nayaya Sanhita, 2023/Sections 308, 323, 149, 148, 452, 506 and 325 of IPC, 1860 (Section 117(2) of BNS/325 IPC added later on) registered at P.S. Kundli, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no specific role or injury has been attributed

to him. He submits that the case is based solely upon the statement of the complainant and other interested witnesses, with no independent witness or CCTV footage connecting the petitioner with the alleged occurrence. It is further argued that no motive has been attributed to the petitioner, nothing is to be recovered from him and the medical opinion shows that only one injury has been declared grievous on account of a fibula fracture.

Learned counsel also submits that similarly situated co-accused, namely Sahil, Neeraj @ Kaku and Chet Ram @ Ankit, have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court and the petitioner claims parity with them.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of Court, Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State.

He opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in one more FIR ie. FIR No. 425/2026 under Section 25 of Arms Act registered at P.S. Kundli. He, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

3. Analysis

After considering the fact that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and that the prosecution case is primarily based upon the statements of the complainant side. It is also not disputed that similarly situated co-accused, namely Sahil, Neeraj @ Kaku and Chet Ram @ Ankit, have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The medical opinion reveals that only one injury has been declared grievous on account of a fibula fracture and no recovery is stated to be effected from the petitioner.

As regards the objection raised by the State regarding the petitioner's involvement in another case under the Arms Act is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “***Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab***” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under subsection (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

- (i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- (ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

10.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No