



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23861-2026

Dalip Singh @ Yamraj
Versus
State of Haryana

...Petitioner
...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.07.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	24.07.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	24.07.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate with
Mr. Souravdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 105 dated 03.08.2025 registered under Sections 110, 115, 190, 191(3) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNS’) (Sections 117(2) and 238(c) of BNS added later on) at Police Station Rohadai, District Rewari.



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by the complainant-Naveen alleging therein that on the night of 01.08.2025, he, along with his friend Rajesh was going towards Village Burawada from Village Palawas on his motorcycle. While on the way, they were intercepted by accused Ravinder, Jatin, Pankaj, and Dinesh, who came in a Scorpio vehicle and tried to wrongfully restrain them. The complainant somehow managed to flee. The above-named persons extended threats to see him on the next day. Thereafter, on 02.08.2025, he was in the gym of his village when the above-named Ravinder and Jatin, accompanied by their accomplices, all of whom were armed with weapons, reached there and opened an assault upon him by causing injuries with their respective weapons. The accused Ravinder then proclaimed that the complainant had died, and thereafter all of them fled away in the two vehicles in which they had come. The complainant identified the driver of the Scorpio vehicle as Jatin @ Kalu. By alleging that he had been assaulted on account of a land dispute, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The complainant recorded a supplementary statement on 16.08.2025, on the basis of which the petitioner was nominated as an accused on the allegation that he was amongst the assailants. The petitioner was arrested on 16.08.2025. The other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.



4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant after recording his supplementary statement after a gap of more than 15 days from the date of the alleged occurrence. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. He is in custody since long. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude as, on allowing of the application under Section 358 of the BNSS, fresh trial has commenced. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that, taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed the membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused, and in pursuance of the common object thereof, he is alleged to have taken the assailants away after the incident in an i20 car, thereby facilitating their fleeing away from the spot. He was not named in the FIR and was named as an accused after about 15 days of the incident. It is not the version of the complainant himself that the petitioner was present at the time of the occurrence as one of the assailants. He is not



required for further investigation. He is in custody since 16.08.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude, as only 01 out of 23 prosecution witnesses has been examined. He is shown to be involved in some other cases; however, he has been acquitted in three of such cases and is on bail in the fourth case. No fruitful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any further. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the acts attributed to him, the period spent by him in custody, and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore and he has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

24th July, 2026
Parveen Sharma

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