

**CRM-M-27132-2025****2**

also received injuries and consequently, DDR No.20 dated 13.04.2025 was registered in the cross-version.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that only a simple injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He has been falsely implicated in the present case and the entire version put forward by the complainant is false and fabricated. Rather, the complainant party had caused serious injuries on the person of Harmesh Chand and he suffered fracture of nasal bone. Cross-version i.e. DDR No.20 dated 13.04.2025 was also registered on the statement of accused Harmesh Chand. He has further contended that in order to save themselves, the complainant got registered present false FIR by fabricating the injuries which are self-inflicted. The dispute is regarding cultivation of Jumla Mustarka Malkan land and one Civil Suit is also pending regarding the same. He has submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and he is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, it has been prayed that the petitioner be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice in this case was issued on 19.05.2025 for today and respondent-State sought time to file Status Report.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present bail petition and has contended that there are serious allegations levelled against the petitioner that he, along with his co-accused, gave beatings to the complainant party with their respective weapons and co-accused Makhan Chand also fired gun shots and the said bullet passed over the head of the complainant. Learned State counsel urged that as the petitioner also actively



CRM-M-27132-2025

3

participated in the occurrence, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations qua the petitioner, he was armed with a stick and he gave a stick blow on the chest of complainant's father namely Warkha Ram. The specific injury attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature. Cross-version in this case has also been registered and it is yet to be determined as to which party was the aggressor. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing bail/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions, as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

May 22, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>