



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

CRM-M-33194-2026(O&M)

Date of decision: 08.06.2026

Krishan Kumar and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate, for
Mr. Narinder S. Lucky, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhishek Walia, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.178, dated 15.05.2026, registered under Sections 110, 115, 117(2), 127(2), 190, 191(3), 3(5), 333, 351(2), 79 of BNS 2023 at P.S. Naraingarh, District Ambala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. She submits that no grievous injuries have been attributed to the petitioners. The injuries suffered by the complainant are simple in nature, i.e. localized swelling over left side forehead and reddish abrasion over middle of left forearm. She further submits that petitioners No.2 to 4 were not present at the spot. The main allegations of causing injury with gandasi and sticks has been attributed to co-accused Prince. Learned counsel for the petitioners



undertakes that the petitioners are ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that the matter is still under investigation. He submits that an unlawful assembly was formed by the accused and acted in furtherance of their common intention. It is contended that the relief of anticipatory bail is to be granted in exceptional cases.

5. Be that as it may, this Court is of the view that no injury has been attributed to the petitioners and the allegations pertain to a sudden quarrel. Thus, keeping in mind the nature of the allegations, the role attributed to the petitioners, as well as the settled principles governing the grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners have succeeded in making out a case for the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. 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 petitioners, wherein they have *bona fide* intentions and are 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.

7. Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to their joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of 10 days from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating



Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below:-

“When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (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.”

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners do not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

9. The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

June 8, 2026

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No