



2026:PHHC:059039

2026:PHHC:059039



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

213

**CRM-M-16947-2026
Date of decision: 20.04.2026**

NARENDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate with
Mrs. Monika Thatai, Advocate,
Ms. Shruti Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Karan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Kumar Bhagal, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0588 dated 07.11.2025, registered under Section(s) 109(1), 115, 127(2), 3(5) and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 109(1) BNS and 127(2) BNS deleted and Section 110 BNS and Section 126 BNS added later on) at Police Station Civil Lines, District Sirsa, the earlier petition having been withdrawn on 16.01.2026.

2. The FIR in the instant case came to be registered on the statement



of Smt. Jai Bala, wife of Rajender Singh, who stated that she resides at JCD, Sirsa, along with her son Rahul, who is employed there and her two-year-old granddaughter, Divyanka. It is alleged that on 06.11.2025 at about 3:30 p.m., while the complainant was taking her granddaughter Divyanka to a nearby park for playing, she was intercepted by her son-in-law Rakesh and his elder brother Narender (petitioner herein), both sons of Kapoor Singh and residents of Sindol, District Hisar, along with another unidentified person. The said persons had arrived in a white Swift car bearing registration No. HR16P1040, which they parked in front of the complainant. It is further alleged that Rakesh forcibly snatched the minor child Divyanka from the complainant, while Narender struck the complainant with the said vehicle with an intention to cause her death, as a result of which she fell to the ground and sustained multiple injuries. Thereafter, the said persons fled from the spot along with the minor child. It is also alleged that while leaving, Rakesh threatened the complainant that if she attempted to locate or see the child, he would kill her. The complainant further stated that upon raising an alarm, one Neelu Jhijha, stated to be a warden, reached the spot and informed the police by dialling 112. It is further alleged that information was also conveyed at the main gate of JCD, Sirsa, in an attempt to stop the vehicle; however, when the gate wardens tried to intercept the said vehicle, it rammed into the gate and fled from the premises. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the complainant sought strict legal action against the named accused persons as well as the unidentified individual accompanying them.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that Priyanka, the wife of Rakesh Kumar (brother of the petitioner), had died



due to cardiac arrest. It is contended that the minor daughter born out of the said wedlock was thereafter taken away by her maternal grandparents and that the family of Rakesh Kumar, including his father-in-law, was not being permitted to meet the child. It is further submitted that the petitioner, along with other family members, had gone to the house of the in-laws of Rakesh Kumar with a view to amicably resolve the dispute relating to the custody of the minor child. Learned counsel contends that, as per the allegations in the FIR, Rakesh Kumar along with the petitioner is stated to have forcibly entered the house, attempted to take away the minor child and allegedly tried to run over the complainant. However, it is argued that the ingredients of the offence under Section 109 are not made out, inasmuch as the injuries sustained by the complainant are simple in nature. Learned counsel further submits that the present case arises out of a familial dispute concerning the custody of a minor child, which has been given a criminal colour and exaggerated so as to falsely implicate the petitioner. It is also submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and has been in custody since 06.11.2025. The investigation in the case stands completed, and no further recovery is to be effected from the petitioner.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State as well as the complainant vehemently oppose the prayer made by the petitioner and contend that the petitioner was driving the vehicle and had helped his brother, Rakesh Kumar, in fleeing from the spot with the minor child. It is further contended that since an attempt was made to run over the complainant with the car hence, the offence under Section 109 would clearly be attracted against the petitioner. It is, however, not disputed that no injury attributable to the act of running over



by the car was sustained by the complainant. They also do not dispute that the petitioner does not suffer from any other criminal antecedents, the investigation in the case is complete and that the co-accused brother, namely Rakesh Kumar, has already been granted concession of regular bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Having heard the counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of custody undergone by him, his clean antecedents as well as the fact that conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

APRIL 20, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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