



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

102

CRM-M-25358-2025

Date of decision : 20.05.2025

Rohit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Karan Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.


H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 39 dated 16.03.2025 under Section 109(1), 115,190,191 (2), 191(3), 61 BNS and 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Sadar Rattia, District Fatehabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith 12 other co-accused and other unknown persons have attacked the complainant party and injured 12 persons of the complainant party. He further submits that the petitioner has not caused any grievous injury and no specific role has been attributed to him. He further submits that the name of the petitioner has not been mentioned in the FIR, whereas in the FIR it has been mentioned that one Gori @ Rovit caused injuries to the complainant party.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She has filed the MLR report of the complainant in the Court today and the same is taken on record.



5. Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant. He has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the complainant being 65 years of old aged person had mispronounced the name of petitioner as Rovit, however, the petitioner is the one who is named in the FIR as Rovit. The petitioner has participated in the occurrence wherein he was a part of the mob, which has caused injuries to the complainant party.

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

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and he played an active role in causing injuries to the complainant party. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and the petitioner is not entitled for concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.

8. Anything stated hereinabove shall have no effect on the merits of the case as it is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition. The trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of material available before it.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

20.05.2025

renu

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