



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

104

CRM-M-24106-2025

Date of decision: 05.05.2025

SELAK @ SELAK RAM

...Petitioner

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Mr.Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.R.S.Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr.Gautam Dutt, Advocate and
Mr.Sushil Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S.GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.95 dated 08.02.2025 under Sections 191(3), 190, 115, 115(2), 324(4), 351(2), 126, 126(2), 109, 117(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 24, 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 115, 126, 351(2) of the BNS and Section 24 of the Arms Act were deleted and Section 109, 115(2), 126(2), 117(2) of the BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act were added later on) registered at Police Station Surajkund, District Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and his co-accused along with 15-20 boys on 06.02.2025 at about 11/12:00 PM at night, demolished the boundary wall and gate of their property. Thereafter, on 07.02.2025 at about 10:00 AM when the complainant was



getting the boundary wall restored, 15-20 boys including the present petitioner along with co-accused armed with lathis, dandas and rods in their hands came to the spot and caused injuries to the complainant and his father.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that although he admits his presence at the spot, but only two of the co-accused namely, Rahul and Sahil have caused injuries and the same is evident from the CCTV footage. The petitioner on one hand states that he was not present at the spot however on the other hand he states that even if he was present at the spot, he did not participate in the occurrence and only two of his co-accused have caused injuries. Learned counsel for the petitioner also states that the occurrence had taken place in two parts; firstly the father suffered injuries which resulted as dangerous to life and the petitioner did not participate in that incident. However the petitioner was present at the time of the incident when the complainant himself was injured and his injuries have been declared to be simple in nature meaning thereby that the petitioner although did not participate but has admitted his presence during the occurrence. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation. He has placed on record the order granting bail to co-accused of the petitioner passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Rajesh Badana Vs State of Haryana**, dated 25th April 2025. He further submits that the co-accused is similarly placed as the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. She, however, submits that



the case of the co-accused is totally different from the petitioner's case as he was not visible in the CCTV footage whereas the petitioner has been seen on the same brandishing a rod.

5. Learned senior counsel for the complainant has stated that the petitioner has admitted his presence at the spot and moreover he claims to be the owner of the disputed property where the said occurrence had taken place and therefore he had the motive for committing the offence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material placed on record.

7. Considering all the contentions of learned counsel for the parties, and the nature of the injuries suffered by the injured persons, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

May 05, 2025
poonam

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No