



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

**CRM-M-1390-2025**

**Date of Decision: 19.02.2025**

Bharat alias Bhalu

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**Coram :    Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**


Present :    Ms. Nisha Rana, Advocate and  
                 Mr. Mukul Chandila, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
                 Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1.            The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.332 dated 21.05.2024 registered under Sections 365, 379-B, 394, 506 and 120-B of IPC (Sections 394 and 120-B of IPC added later on and the offence under Section 379-B deleted) and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sector-8, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2.            Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by his co-accused. Even as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner was only stated to be present at the place of occurrence and no specific role has been assigned to him. She further contends that a case of minor scuffle has been illegally converted into a serious crime, without any incriminating evidence to that effect. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 26.05.2024 and challan has already been presented against him. Even, co-accused, Rahul Bhudena has already been



granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 03.12.2024 (Annexure P-2). Similarly, another co-accused Tokkir alias Sahil has also been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 06.09.2024 (Annexure P-3). She further contends that challan has already been presented against the petitioner and his further custody will not serve any meaningful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody for the last about 07 months. The police has already presented the challan against the petitioner but the trial is not likely to conclude in near future. Still further, co-accused, namely, Rahul Bhudena and Tokkir alias Sahil have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders Annexures P-2 and P-3 respectively.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

19.02.2025  
hemlata

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