IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-66643-2026
Date of Decision: 21.11.2026

Dharmender Dudi alias Dharmender alias Mahender Dharamender Dudi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

*****

Present: Mr. Ajay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Sahni, Addl. A.G, Haryana.

*****

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNSS') is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.536 dated 10.10.2026, registered at Police Station Azad Nagar, District Hisar, under Sections 305 and 331(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'the BNS').

2. The allegation is that the car of the petitioner had been impounded while was found driving the same in a drunkard condition. Accordingly, challans for drunken were also issued. The petitioner is alleged to have stolen the said impounded vehicle from the premises of the

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that the petitioner was issued challans on 01.10.2026 with a view to implicate him in the matter and his car was also taken from his farm on the same day at about 2:41 a.m. after the petitioner had refused to succumb to monetary demands made by the police personnel. He further submits that this is so recorded in the CCTV footage installed in the farm of the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that though, as per the Investigating Agency, the petitioner had stolen his car from the police station on 05.10.2026, the FIR was got registered on 10.10.2026. He further submits that the co-accused were arrested and the car was recovered and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as no recovery is to be made from him. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is willing to join investigation and abide by any condition imposed by the Court.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, who is present on advance copy having been served, submits that there is no merit in the petition for, the petitioner clearly stole the vehicle from the police station in the early hours of 05.10.2026 and only when the police came to know about it, the CCTV footage was checked and then the FIR was registered. It has been submitted that keeping in view the nature of the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, there is no occasion to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. The petitioner is allegedly [illegible]

the petitioner dared to commit a theft in the police station. This Court is not inclined to go into the version of the petitioner at this stage that he was intentionally issued challans and that his vehicle was taken away since he did not succumb to monetary demands. These allegations do not outweigh the allegations in the FIR.

7. Keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances, this Court finds no reason to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

21.11.2026
mamta

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