



CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

CRM-M-57387-2025

Ved Parkash

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
109-2

.....Respondent

CRM-M-67975-2025

Rohit

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Decided on: 26.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Jagjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By way of this common order, both the aforementioned petitions are being disposed of as they arise out of one common FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 435 dated 11.09.2025. The FIR was registered at Police Station Mujesar, Faridabad, initially under Sections 351(2), 333, 324(4), 191(3), 191(2), 190, 126(2), and 115(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) (erstwhile Sections 506, 452, 427, 148, 147, 149, 341, and 323 of the IPC). Sections 117(2) and 109 of the BNS (erstwhile Sections 325 and 307 of the IPC) were subsequently added.



CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025

2

2. On 14.10.2025, following order was recorded in CRM-M-57387-2025:

“1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 435 dated 11.09.2025. The FIR was registered at Police Station Mujesar, Faridabad, initially under Sections 351(2), 333, 324(4), 191(3), 191(2), 190, 126(2), and 115(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) (erstwhile Sections 506, 452, 427, 148, 147, 149, 341, and 323 of the IPC). Sections 117(2) and 109 of the BNS (erstwhile Sections 325 and 307 of the IPC) were subsequently added.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged incident took place on 07.09.2025 inside the house of the complainant, Roshni. FIR was registered on 11.09.2025 based on a complaint presented on 10.09.2025. Despite this delay in the registration of the FIR and moving of the complaint, there is no explanation as to which specific accused caused the particular injury which is declared to be dangerous to life. FIR names five individuals: i) Mohit, ii) Rohit, iii) Sohiti, iv) Ved Prakash (petitioner herein), and v) Vishal, along with 15-20 other unknown persons.

*3 Mr. Kunal Dawar submits that the injury deemed dangerous to life was suffered by Tejpal. However, during investigation, it has been specifically concluded that **no molestation is found to have occurred with any woman.***

*Counsel further submits that though injured-Tejpal, was declared **fit for statement on 09.09.2025**, he stated he would give his statement on 10.09.2025 after thinking. However, instead of recording the injured's statement first, the complainant, Roshni, went to the police post along*



**CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025**

3

with her relative, Ombir, and submitted the application on 10.09.2025.

Referring to the Medico-Legal Reports (MLRs) of persons who suffered injuries from the petitioner's party, namely Sohit (P-5), Mohit (P-6), and Rohit (P-7), Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the incident, in fact, took place inside the house of the accused party. Moreover, written complaint moved by complainant Roshni contains no disclosure regarding the injuries sustained by the petitioner's party.

Counsel finally submits that the truth is yet to be ascertained by the prosecuting agency regarding which party was the aggressor, and because there is no specific attribution of a grave injury to any single accused. Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation provided he is protected from arrest.

4. Notice of motion. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana, appears on behalf of the respondent – State.

5. Learned State Counsel is directed to file a Status Report, specifically responding to the submissions addressed by the counsel for the petitioner and recorded hereinabove. Status Report must also specify the evidence, if any, regarding the injury suffered by Tejpal and who caused the said injury.

6. List on 11.12.2025.

7. Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.”

Similarly on 03.12.2025 following was recorded in CRM-M-67975-2025:



CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025

4

“1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the *Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS)*, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 435 dated 11.09.2025. The FIR was registered at Police Station Mujesar, Faridabad, initially under Sections 351(2), 333, 324(4), 191(3), 191(2), 190, 126(2), and 115(2) of the *Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)* (erstwhile Sections 506, 452, 427, 148, 147, 149, 341, and 323 of the IPC). Sections 117(2) and 109 of the BNS (erstwhile Sections 325 and 307 of the IPC) were subsequently added.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged incident took place on 07.09.2025 inside the house of the complainant, Roshni. FIR was registered on 11.09.2025 based on a complaint presented on 10.09.2025. Despite this delay in the registration of the FIR and moving of the complaint, there is no explanation as to which specific accused caused the particular injury which is declared to be dangerous to life. FIR names five individuals: i) Mohit, ii) Rohit(petitioner herein), iii) Sohni, iv) Ved Prakash , and v) Vishal, along with 15-20 other unknown persons.

3 Mr. Kunal Dawar submits that the injury deemed dangerous to life was suffered by Tejpal. However, during investigation, it has been specifically concluded that **no molestation is found to have occurred with any woman.**

Counsel further submits that though injured-Tejpal, was declared **fit for statement on 09.09.2025**, he stated he would give his statement on 10.09.2025 after thinking. However, instead of recording the injured's statement first, the complainant, Roshni, went to the police post along with her relative, Ombir, and submitted the application on 10.09.2025.

Referring to the Medico-Legal Reports (MLRs) of persons who suffered injuries from the petitioner's party,



CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025

5

namely Sohit (P-5), Mohit (P-6), and Rohit (P-7), Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the incident, in fact, took place inside the house of the accused party. Moreover, written complaint moved by complainant Roshni contains no disclosure regarding the injuries sustained by the petitioner's party.

Counsel finally submits that the truth is yet to be ascertained by the prosecuting agency regarding which party was the aggressor, and because there is no specific attribution of a grave injury to any single accused. Counsel also submits that co-accused namely, Ved Parkash has already been granted the concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 14.10.2025(P-8) passed in CRM-M-57387-2025 Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation provided he is protected from arrest.

4. *Notice of motion. On advance notice, Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana, appears on behalf of the respondent – State.*

5. *Learned State Counsel is directed to file a Status Report, specifically responding to the submissions addressed by the counsel for the petitioner and recorded hereinabove. Status Report must also specify the evidence, if any, regarding the injury suffered by Tejpal and who caused the said injury.*

6. *List on 11.12.2025.*

7. *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.*

8. *To be heard alongwith CRM-M-57387-2025."*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned Senior Counsel submits
that there are five injured persons from the petitioner's side, and some of



**CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025**

6

the injuries are grievous in nature; yet, no case has been registered against the complainant party. Counsel further submits that the status report records that the petitioner's party was the aggressor and not the complainant party, which, is beyond the domain of the Investigating Officer to determine at this stage.

Learned Senior counsel further submits that, from the complainant's side, there are four injured persons and, qua the two injuries found on the head of injured Tejpal, all the accused from the petitioner's side have been made to face charges under Section 109 of the BNS.

4. Learned Senior Counsel also reiterates that the incident took place on 07.09.2025; the first complaint was submitted by Roshni w/o Ajit on 10.09.2025, and the FIR was registered on 11.09.2025. Even as per the status report, Tejpal was declared fit to give his statement on 09.09.2025; however, he got his statement recorded only on 18.09.2025, wherein, for the first time, he attributed the head injury jointly to petitioner Rohit and the other two accused, namely Mohit and Sohith. It is also pointed out that, except for Rohit, the other two accused who were attributed injuries on the head with a rod and *dandas* are already in custody. Since only two injuries were found on the head of Tejpal, it would be a debatable issue whether all three accused—Rohit, Mohit, and Sohith—are responsible for causing the head injuries, or only two of them. As the issue regarding which party was the aggressor is yet to be



**CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025**

7

determined by the learned trial Court, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who are ready to join the investigation.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the offence under Section 109 of the BNS has been made out as the injury was declared dangerous to life, and petitioner Rohit is one of the accused attributed with causing the head injury to Tejpal. He, therefore, prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

7. As per the status report, Tejpal got his statement recorded on 18.09.2025, though he had been declared fit to make a statement on 09.09.2025 itself. Whether the allegations are exaggerated or a natural version of events shall be determined by the learned trial Court after appreciation of the complete evidence on record. It is not denied that there are five injured persons from the petitioner's side as well; however, they have been found to be the aggressors and, on that account, the complainant party has not been proceeded against for the alleged offences.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any substantial reason to subject the petitioners to custodial interrogation at this stage. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed.

Petitioners are directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today. In the event of their arrest, petitioners shall be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the



**CRM-M-57387-2025 and
CRM-M-67975-2025**

8

Arresting Officer. However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

8. Accordingly, petitions stand disposed of.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

26.02.2026

Rashmi

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