



CRM-M-4465-2025 and
CRM-M-22680-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-4465-2025

Suraj

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana
220-2

. . . Respondent(s)

CRM-M-22680-2025

Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

Decided on :19.11.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-4465-2025).

Mr. Sahil Nain, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-22680-2025).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arpandeep Narula, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Both the aforementioned petitions are being decided by way of this common order, as they arise out of one and the same FIR.
2. Petitioners, namely Suraj and Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu, have filed the present petitions under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 198 dated 04.09.2024, registered under Sections 303, 111, and 317(2) of BNSS at Police Station Rai, District Sonipat.



**CRM-M-4465-2025 and
CRM-M-22680-2025**

2

3. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel informed that after registration of the FIR, secret information regarding the commission of the offence was received from the complainant-Ajay Kumar Verma (Advocate). At first instance, accused **Suraj (petitioner in CRM-M-4465-2025)**, Karma @ Avtar, and **Vishal @ Prakash @ Vishu (petitioner in CRM-M-22680-2025)** were arrested and joined in the investigation. During the course of their disclosure statements, the name of another person, Chandru, also came to light.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that a false case has been planted against the petitioners, and there is no direct evidence linking them to the commission of the offence. It is further submitted that the incident allegedly took place on 24.08.2024, whereas the FIR was registered only on 04.09.2024, after a delay of about ten days. Considering that complainant is an educated professional in the field of advocacy, such a delay raises the possibility of introduction of false allegations. Moreover, complainant has already been examined in Court, and petitioners are in custody for over one year and two months. Learned counsel submits that continued detention of the petitioners would serve no meaningful purpose and, therefore, prays for the grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by counsel for the complainant, submits that petitioners are habitual offenders and have been found involved in several other cases. Learned State counsel further submits that petitioner-Suraj is implicated in nine other cases,



**CRM-M-4465-2025 and
CRM-M-22680-2025**

3

whereas petitioner-Vishal has been found involved in three other cases.

Learned counsel further submits that their involvement in multiple criminal cases indicates a pattern of unlawful activity, which cannot be ignored. Granting bail at this stage, in view of their antecedents, may pose a risk of the petitioners tampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, or fleeing from the jurisdiction. Therefore, learned State counsel prays dismissal of present petitions.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto.

7. Taking into account all the facts and circumstances as explained by the respective counsel and noticed hereinabove, this Court observes that complainant has not offered any satisfactory explanation for the delay of ten days in getting the FIR registered. However, no conclusion on this aspect can be drawn at the stage of the present petition, as it is a matter to be examined during the trial. It is also noticed that the arrests of the three accused-Suraj, Karma, and Vishal were not based on direct evidence collected under the present FIR, but were made on the basis of secret information. The legality and authenticity of such arrests are matters to be determined by the trial Court at the appropriate stage.

Considering these circumstances, and in view of the fact that petitioners have already undergone detention for over one year and two



**CRM-M-4465-2025 and
CRM-M-22680-2025**

4

months, the Court is of the view that continued incarceration is not warranted.

Consequently, present petitions stand allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioners are found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

10. Petitions stand disposed of.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

19.11.2025

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*