

CRM-M-2563-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.228

Case No. : CRM-M-2563-2025

Decided On : November 10, 2025

Dharamender @ Dharma Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Aakash Juneja, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.120 dated 11.05.2024, under Sections 147, 149, 307, 120-B IPC and Sections 25/27-54-59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar.

Briefly, the case of the prosecution is that on 11.05.2024, during routine patrolling, police got information that one Sahil had sustained fire-arm injury and had been admitted in hospital. Police reached the hospital and father of the injured gave written complaint, wherein he stated that on 10.05.2024, he and his son Sahil were coming to Beri to attend a marriage. He was in separate vehicle whereas his son Sahil was in a hired car and was driving the said car. At about 10:00 PM, when they reached near Jat




Dharamshala, Beri, two boys came on a motorcycle and stopped near Sahil's car. Thereafter, one boy fired upon Sahil and fled away from the spot. The complainant shifted his son to hospital with the help of others. On the basis of his statement, the FIR in question was registered. During investigation, supplementary statement of Mahesh (father of injured Sahil) was recorded, wherein it was revealed that the petitioner along with others was actively involved in the commission of offence in question.

Learned counsel for petitioner contended that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. There is no direct evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question. He has been involved in the present case only on the basis of supplementary statement of complainant. He has further urged that trial of the case is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposed the present bail petition while contending that the petitioner, along with other co-accused, attempted to murder Sahil. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious and therefore, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

The petitioner has not been named in the FIR. Later on, his name cropped up during the supplementary statement of complainant, recorded on 14.05.2024. The fire-arm injury is not attributed to the petitioner and that injury is attributed to co-accused Sombir. Two of the co-accused namely **Sunny** and **Harsh** had already been granted concession of regular bail by a



Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 27.11.2024 and 09.12.2024 passed in CRM-M-58341-2024 and CRM-M-60544-2024 respectively. Challan has already been presented in this case. Out of 27 prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been examined so far.

As per the Custody Certificate dated 07.11.2025, which has been placed on record, the petitioner has already undergone custody of 01 year 05 months and 21 days. Trial of the case is going on, conclusion whereof is likely to take long time. So, no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned Trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

November 10, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No.
Whether reportable ?	Yes/No.