

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

218

Date of decision: 14.10.2025

1. CRM-M-45067-2025

VANSH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-46693-2025

AMIT

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. Manvender Chauhan, Advocate  
for the petitioners.


Mr. R.K. Ambavta, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Parul Saini, Advocate for the complainant.

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)**

1. This order shall dispose of above noted two petitions, as the same have emanated out of the same occurrence.

2. Prayer in these petitions under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.469, dated 26.07.2025, registered at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat, under Sections 109 (1), 115, 190, 191(3), 324 (6), 333 and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 (Section 253-B of BNS, 2023 added later on).



3. Status reports dated 08.10.2025 by way of affidavit of Atma Ram, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Panipat have been filed on behalf of respondent-State in both the petitions respectively and the same are taken on record.

4. On 19.08.2025 in CRM-M-45067-2025, following order was passed:-  
*Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.469, dated 26.07.2025, registered at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat, under Sections 109 (1), 115, 190, 191(3), 324 (6), 333 and 351(3) of BNS, 2023.*

*The present case was registered on the basis statement given to the police by Bheem Singh with the allegation that he runs a sweet shop in Village Rakseda. About one year ago, one Rohit had a quarrel with his grandson Shivam regarding which they had submitted a complaint to the police but the matter was settled with the intervention of villagers. However, said Rohit started nursing a grudge against their family. On 25.07.2025, at 8:00 PM, his grandson Shubham and another boy were present at the shop when Rohit and Ashok alongwith 20-30 persons who had kept their faces muffled entered the shop and they were armed with lathis, dandas and gandasa and they started causing injuries to his grandson Shivam and damaged the articles lying in the shop as well as motorcycle and scooty. Thereafter, they entered the house and when his son Monu, his wife Krishna and wives of his sons namely Anita and Monika tried to rescue him, they caused injuries to them and had torn their clothes. On seeing public approaching, all the assailants ran away.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has not been named in the FIR. No injury is attributed to him and even as per CCTV footage collected by the police, he was not seen causing any injury to the victim and he was only present at the spot. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by*



- 3-

*the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.*

*On other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and does not deserved the concession of anticipatory bail.*

*Notice of motion.*

*Mr. R.K. Ambavta, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A copy of paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.*

*Adjourned to **14.10.2025** for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C.*

5. On 25.08.2025 in CRM-M-46693-2025, following order was passed:-  
*“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.469, dated 26.07.2025, registered at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat, under Sections 109 (1), 115, 190, 191(3), 324 (6), 333 and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 (Section 253-B of BNS, 2023 added later on).*

*The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Bheem Singh with the allegation that he runs a sweet shop in Village Rakseda. About one year ago, one Rohit had a quarrel with his grandson Shivam regarding which they had submitted a complaint to the police but the matter was settled with the intervention of villagers. However, said Rohit started nursing a grudge against their family. On 25.07.2025, at 8:00 PM, his grandson Shubham and another boy were present at the shop when Rohit and Ashok alongwith 20-30 persons who had kept their faces muffled entered the shop and they were armed with lathis, dandas and gandasa and they started causing injuries to his grandson Shivam and damaged the articles lying in the shop as well as motorcycle and scooty. Thereafter, they entered the house and when his son Monu, his wife Krishna and wives of his sons namely Anita and*



- 4-

*Monika tried to rescue him, they caused injuries to them and had torn their clothes. On seeing public approaching, all the assailants ran away.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has not been named in the FIR. No injury is attributed to him and even as per CCTV footage collected by the police, he was not seen causing any injury to the victim and he was only present at the spot. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.*

*On other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.*

*Notice of motion.*

*Mr. R.K. Ambavta, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.*

*Ms. Parul Saini, advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed vakalatnama which is taken on record. Counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the bail application.*

*Adjourned to 14.10.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C.*

*To be heard along with CRM-M-45067-2025.”*

6. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioners have joined the investigation, in compliance of the orders dated 19.08.2025 and 25.08.2025 and are no longer required for further investigation.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the orders dated 19.08.2025 and 25.08.2025,



whereby the petitioners were granted interim anticipatory bail, are hereby made absolute. However, they shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

8. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.
10. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)**  
**JUDGE**

**14.10.2025**  
**amandeep**

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No