

CRM-M-173-2025 and connected case

-1-

2025.PHHC-041793



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

225 (two cases)

CRM-M-173-2025

Date of Decision: 26.03.2025

(1) Sukhvinder @ Golu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM M-1734 of 2025 (O&M)

(2) Bunty

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Vikas Saroha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-173-2025.

Mr. S.S. Nain, Advocate &
Ms. Tanya Vashist, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-1734-2025.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off two bail petitions, i.e., CRM M-173-2025 titled as “**Sukhvinder @ Golu Vs. State of Haryana**” and CRM-M-1734-2025 titled as “**Bunty Vs. State of Haryana**”, whereby, the petitioners have applied for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No.730 dated 10.11.2022 under Sections 148, 149, 323 & 302 of IPC (Annexure P-1) registered at Police Station Sector-8 Faridabad, District Fardiabad.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the allegations have been primarily levelled against Firoj Khan, co-accused and even the motive is alleged against him. As per the allegations levelled by the complainant, no specific role has been assigned to both the petitioners. Moreover, PW-1 Yashveer, complainant and PW-2 Seema wife of Pappu Singh had not supported the case of the prosecution. Moreover, Sukhvinder @ Golu was arrested on 19.11.2022, whereas Bunty was arrested on 13.11.2022 and are in custody since then. Learned counsel for the petitioners(s) further refers to orders Annexures P-4 and P-5 passed by this Court, whereby Rohit @ Balla and Suraj @ Jagvir have been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner(s) and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He has also filed the replies in both the cases by way of an affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police Ballabgarh, District Faridabad on behalf of the respondent-State and the same are taken on record.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.



5. In the present case, it is not in dispute that two similarly placed co-accused Rohit @ Balla and Suraj @ Jagvir have been admitted to bail by this Court. Moreover, the petitioner(s) are in custody since last more than two and half years and their further custody will not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, PW-1 Yashveer and PW-2 Seema have not fully supported the case of the prosecution.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s), disposed of, accordingly.

26.03.2025
vipin

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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