



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

(103)

**CRM-M-34484 of 2026
Date of Decision: 03.07.2026**

Ramesh

...Petitioner

VS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Sarvesh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Addl.AG., Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.171 dated 03.04.2026, registered under Sections 109, 115, 351(3), 190, 191(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Azad Nagar, District Hisar.

2. On 03.04.2026, an incident took place near Creative Vision School, Village Mangali, District Hisar in which the complainant Bir Singh and one Amardeep were allegedly attacked by Satish Bhakar, Pawan, Kavita, Anuradha, the present petitioner and 8/10 other people with sticks, bricks and rods. After this, they are stated to have taken Amardeep to the hospital in a school van and projected it to be a case of a road-side accident and fled from there. On the statement of Bir Singh, FIR No. 171 dated 03.04.2026, under Sections 109, 115, 351(3), 190, 191(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Azad Nagar, District Hisar, was registered with the aforesaid allegations. It was also alleged that his gold chain weighing 3 tolas

and Amardeep's chain weighing 4 tolas were forcibly snatched by the culprits. Satish Bhakar, Pawan son of Ugrasen and Pawan Punia, who is the nephew of Pawan son of Ugrasen were arrested. The petitioner is the driver of the bus of the school whose director is Satish Bhakar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is only the driver of the school bus and had come to the spot at a later stage and did not commit any offence. He refers to the disclosure statements of the arrested accused which have been annexed with the status report and has submitted that even as per the disclosure reports, initially a scuffle took place after which the petitioner and other persons intervened. He further submits that the petitioner had initially been found to be innocent by the investigating agency but later on when an SIT was formed, he was falsely implicated. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents and his custodial interrogation is not required. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is willing to join investigation and abide by any condition imposed by the Court.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are very serious. It has been argued that the injured Amardeep suffered multiple skull bone fractures as a result of which he sustained neurological injuries. Apart from the fracture in the skull, he suffered multiple fractures on the face as well. The said injuries had been declared to be dangerous to life. It has been submitted that though accused-Satish and Pawan son of Ugrasen and Pawan Punia are in custody, the arrest and consequential custodial interrogation of the petitioner is also imperative to elicit the truth. As regards the petitioner having been declared innocent earlier, it has been submitted

that the previous IO had declared the petitioner innocent on 11.04.2026, whereas the statement of Amardeep was recorded on 02.05.2026 as previously he was not fit to make a statement.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Allegations against the petitioner and co-accused are extremely serious. They are allege to have beaten up two people with sticks and rods as a result of which one of them namely Amardeep suffered skull bone fractures and facial fractures. He is not able to speak even today. The report of Dr. Ashish Jain, Neuro Surgeon sends shivers down one's spine. The said Amardeep Singh is fortunate to have survived after the murderous attack. The argument that the petitioner had been initially found to be innocent does not come to his aid as the statement of Amardeep Singh was recorded on 02.05.2026 much after the petitioner had been declared innocent by the previous IO after which an SIT had been formed.

7. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations and the nature of offence committed, this Court does not find the present case to be one where the concession of anticipatory bail can be or should be extended.

That being so, the present petition is found to be devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

July 03, 2026
Rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No