



**219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-71644-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.01.2026

Anand Prakash and another

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sudhanshu Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Aayush Bansal, Advocate
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case
bearing FIR No.89 dated 29.08.2025, under Section(s) 117(2), 115(2), 110, 190,
191(2), 351(3), 331(6), 238 BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Jatusana,
District Rewari.

2 FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of statement
of Satraj s/o Ramdat, which reads as under:

*“To, the SHO, Police Station Jatusana, Rewari
(Haryana) Subject: Complaint against Rajesh, Praveen,
Anand, Chaman Prakash, Monu and 4-5 others regarding
entering my house and beating me badly and trying to kill me.
Sir, it is humbly requested that I, Satraj s/o Ramdat, am the
resident of Jatusana. On the night of 28/29.08.2025 at about
02.00 am, the above 10-11 persons entered my house and
while I was sleeping, gagged my mouth and gave beatings*



with rods and sticks and badly injured my legs, hands, chest, waist and shoulders with iron rods and sticks. Since there was a land dispute between we brothers and in-laws due to which we had a rift between us. Yesterday on 28/08/25, Rajesh's daughter was born for which there was a (kua puja) well worship program/ ceremony. After the program was over, all these 10-11 men entered my house with full preparation with the intention of killing me. After entering the house, they gagged my mouth and hit me badly with an iron rod. When they thought that I was dead, they left me and ran away. Sir, their intention was to kill me. At night, Balram, my son, and Khushiram S/o Ramprasad picked me up and took me to the hospital. Strictest action should be taken against the above accused. Thank you SD/-”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case by the prosecution with the collusion of the complainant. He submits that while petitioner No.1 Anand Prakash is working as computer operator in HSBC, Gurugram, petitioner No.2 Parvinder Kumar is working with Canal Department under Kaushal Rojgar Scheme. He contends that the allegations are general in nature and no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners. The nature of injuries primarily attract offences under Sections 115 and 117 of BNS, which are bailable offences. Basic ingredients to attract the offence under Section 110 BNS would not be made out and has only been added to give weight to the offences. He further submits that the petitioners are not involved in any other case. The petitioners are in custody since 30.08.2025 and have already undergone a custody of nearly five months. The investigation in the present case is complete and challan has been



filed. Charges are yet to be framed and thus, trial will take considerable time to conclude.

4. On the other hand, State counsel along with the counsel for the complainant contends that the petitioners have been specifically named in the FIR in question and they caused 12 injuries to the complainant along with other accused out of which four were on the legs and two were on the elbows; others were abrasion and bruises. It is however, not disputed that the injuries are simple in nature as would fall in the category of offences under Sections 115 and 117 of BNS, 2023, which are bailable by nature. The stage of trial, the period of custody as well as criminal antecedents of the petitioners are also not disputed.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations levelled; the period of custody, the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6 It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

7 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

21.01.2026
sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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