



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

131

CRM-M-13078-2025

Date of decision: 07.03.2025

Ravinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Shubham Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Naveen Kumar Jaglan, Advocate for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.173 dated 11.10.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1),118(2),190,191(1),333,351(2) of BNS registered at P.S Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“ 1. Copy of the complaint is as Follows: To SHO PS Ismailabad, Subject:- Respected Sir, it is submitted that I, Prince kumar Son of Pawan Kumar, age 34 years mobile 8295168481, resident of Jaat Mohala Village Ismailabad District Kurukshetra and is engaged in buffalo selling business, that before elections Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda son of Ajmer Singh resident of Jaat Mohalla, village Ismailabad, was having grudge with me and my brother Rajeev Kumar @ Rimpny, that we had forgot about this but Sukvinder Singh @ Binda having anger in his heart. That on 10.10.2024 above said Sukvinder Singh @ Binda at about 7.30 along with 6-7 persons came to our house but only ladies and children's were present in the



house, Sukhvinder Singh left after arguing and threatening them that at about 8 pm when we return home, our ladies told us Sukhvinder Singh came and left after arguing with them, that at about 10.45 pm when we were present with at our house along with ladies and children's then Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda resident of Ismailabad alongwith his two real nephews (Banje) in vehicle no. PB11QS8858 along with 18-20 young person's armed with wooden Sticks/bat, Kirpan, and Gandasi, attacked upon us and entered into our house and started beating ladies and children and Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda with having a sharp object in his hand caused injuries on various parts of my body and rest of the boys, name not known to me, gave stick/bat blow on my legs due to which I, suffered injuries on my head, arm and left leg, that during this quarrel accused persons snatched gold chain weighing around 1.25 Grams from my neck. That Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda r/o of Jaat Mohalla, Ismailabad and other 20-22 unknown boys have caused injuries to me in my house and while leaving had threatened to kill me by saying that today you are spared, next will kill you and your brother Rimpay, that legal action be taken against the accused persons and justice be provided to me.”

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been embroiled in the present case. Name of the petitioner has surfaced in the disclosure statement made by co-accused Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda. No injury has been attributed to the present petitioner and the injuries whatsoever caused on the person of complainant, have been attributed to the co-accused Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda. That apart, the petitioner seeks parity with co-accused Babbar Singh, who has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 27.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-11905-2025 (Annexure P.2).

Notice of motion.

**On behalf of the State**

On the asking of the Court, Mr. B.S. Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who does not controvert the aforesaid facts and could not put forth any incriminating evidence to substantiate the averments made in the FIR.

4. Analysis

Be that as it may, considering the fact that the petitioner was nominated as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Sukhvinder Singh @ Binda and the fact that the co-accused namely Babbar Singh has already been granted the concession of bail by the trial Court and also the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

5. Relief

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;



(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

07.03.2025
manoj

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |