



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRA-S-2338-2026
Decided on : 27.08.2026

PRITTAM

.....Appellant

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Kashish Sahni, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Garg, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the order dated 06.07.2026 passed by Court of Additional Session Judge, Bhiwani, whereby the being second regular bail application of the appellant, arising out of FIR No.27 dated 03.03.2026 registered under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 117(4), 324(4), 333, 110, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 (earlier 149, 147, 323, 325, 427, 452, 308, 506 IPC) & Section 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989, registered at Police Station Jui Kalan, Bhiwani, was dismissed.

2. Case of the prosecution, as discussed in the order dated 06.07.2026, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani, is reproduced here under, for reference:-



“Complainant-injured Satish son of Hoshiyar Singh, resident of Nawa, Tehsil and District Bhiwani, got recorded his statement, to the police, stated therein that ‘he is doing agriculture work. He has three children i.e. one son and two daughters, who are unmarried. On 02.03.2026, at around 09:00 PM, his uncle's son Ajit son of Munshi Ram, resident of Nawa went to celebrate Holi, where one Sahil son of Sumer alias Pillu had quarreled with Ajit. The people present there got separated them, counselled them and sent them to their homes. At around 11:00 PM, Pritam {petitioner-accused} son of Pawan, Sahil son of Sumer alias Pilu, Sachin son of Sumer alias Pilu, Shyamsunder alias Kalu son of Ram Niwas, Ishant son of Pawan, Lalit son of Bajrang, Manish son of Sajjan, residents of village Nawa and 10-15 other persons, who were armed with sticks, came to their street. They broke four bikes and one scooter parked there. They broke the gate of Satbir Panch's house and then they entered into his house. Pritam son of Pawan hit on his head with a stick, due to which, he became unconscious. When his wife Sharda tried to save him, then they also caused injuries to his wife Sharda, Kapil son of Mahender, Anita wife of Satyawar, Satyawar son of Shobha and Narender Singh son of Rajender Singh, residents of Nawa. After giving beatings, the assailants threatened them and then fled away from the spot. Thereafter, their family members and relatives got them admitted in Civil Hospital, Bhiwani. However, due to serious condition, he was referred to PGIMS, Rohtak, where he has been getting treatment. A prayer is made to take strict legal action



*against the persons who had caused injuries to them.
On the basis of this application, FIR was registered.”*

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that there are five injured persons in the present case, namely, Sharda, Kapil, Anita, Satyawar and Narender Singh. There are nine accused in the present case, namely, Pritam (appellant herein), Sahil, Sachin, Shyam Sunder, Lalit, Naveen, Nishant, Ravi and Manish.

4. It is further submitted that role attributed to the present appellant is that of having inflicted a stick blow on the head of the complainant-Satish, and the said injury has been opined to be punishable under Section 110 of the BNS (Section 308 of the IPC).

However, learned counsel submits that, out of the nine accused, eight have already been released on bail. It is further submitted that, except of the injury attributed to the appellant, injuries suffered by injured Anita and Satyawar are also on non-vital parts of the body.

5. Learned counsel further submits that both the parties are co-villagers and appellant is inside jail for a period of approximately four months. It is also submitted that appellant has no previous criminal antecedents. Learned counsel points out that charges in the present case have already been framed and conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the appellant in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the appellant, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate



dated 25.08.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the appellant.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, appellant has already undergone 03 months and 27 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

7. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the appellant, submits that, having regard to the gravity and nature of the offence, appellant does not deserve the concession of regular bail in the present case.

8. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available on file.

9. Upon being asked by the Court, learned State counsel submits that the injured remained hospitalized for a period of three days and was thereafter discharged.

10. Having regard to the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations levelled against the appellant, factors noticed here above, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the appellant in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present appeal is **allowed**. Appellant is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief



Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the appellant shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly, and in case, any threat is extended by the appellant, prosecution as well as complainant is at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of present bail order.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

13. Appeal stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.08.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO