



103

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

CRM-M-34314-2026

Date of Decision : 26.06.2026

YUVRAJ SINGH**.....Petitioner**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**.....Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Ms. Bisman Mann, Advocate and
Mr. Simranjit Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 122 dated 29.05.2026, registered under Sections 115, 118(1), 126, 190, 191(3), 351(3) and 118(2) (added later on)/323, 324, 339, 149, 148 and 326 (added later on) of the BNS at Police Station Safidon, District Jind, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, though the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence is not denied, the incident was a fight between two groups of young persons in which both sides suffered injuries.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rahul Dev, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Amit Khatkar, Advocate accepts notice on

behalf of the complainant and has filed his Vakalatnama. The same is taken on record.

5. A short affidavit of Mr. Gaurav Sharma, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Safidon has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State. The same is taken on record.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, especially when the petitioner himself had also suffered injuries during the said incident.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submits that the victim suffered grievous injuries inflicted by both a sharp-edged weapon and a blunt weapon. It is further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary, particularly as the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the investigation is being carried out in accordance with law and that whatever transpires during the course of investigation shall be duly recorded. It is further submitted that if it is found that the petitioner had also suffered injuries, the same shall also be taken into consideration.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the present case with their able assistance.

10. Since the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence is not disputed and it is also not disputed that the victim suffered grievous

injuries, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary, inter alia, for the recovery of the weapon of offence.

11. Further, once a sharp-edged weapon was allegedly used to inflict injuries upon the victim and the injuries are stated to have been caused on the face and other vital parts of the body, no case for the grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

12. Keeping in view the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Adri Dharan Das vs. State of West Bengal, AIR 2005 SC 1057*** wherein, it is a settled principle of law that custodial interrogation is one of the most effective means to elicit the truth behind the allegations. The relevant paragraph of the said judgment is as under:-

“Ordinarily, arrest is a part of the process of investigation intended to secure several purposes. The accused may have to be questioned in detail regarding various facets of motive, preparation, commission and aftermath of the crime and the connection of other persons, if any, in the crime. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts. It may be necessary to curtail his freedom in order to enable the investigation to proceed without hindrance and to protect witnesses and persons connected with the victim of the crime, to prevent his disappearance to maintain law and order in the locality. For these or other reasons, arrest may become inevitable part of the process of investigation. The legality of the proposed arrest cannot be gone into in an application under [Section 438](#) of the Code. The role of the investigator is well-defined and the jurisdictional scope of interference by the Court in the process of investigation is limited. The Court ordinarily will not interfere with the investigation of a crime or with the arrest of accused in a cognizable offence. An interim order restraining arrest, if passed while dealing with an application under [Section 438](#) of the Code will amount to interference in the investigation, which cannot, at any rate, be done under [Section 438](#) of the Code.”

12. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

26-06-2026
Sapna Goyal

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/ reasoned: YES
Whether reportable: NO