

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-6787-2025
Date of decision: 09.07.2025

VISHAL ALIAS BACHI....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok S. Chaudhary, Additional A.G., Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s))	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vishal Alias Bachi	340	02.08.2024	115, 118(1), 190, 191(3), 351(2) and 61 of BNS but during investigati on Sections 118(2) and 61(2) of BNS have been added	Sadar Fatehabad,	Fatehabad

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that all the offences are



- 2-

triable by the Court of Magistrate and as per the allegations, petitioner was armed with iron kapa and his name was not there even in the FIR and it is after a delay of 20 days, complainant namely Jeet Singh named the petitioner as accused.

Co-accused of the petitioner namely Sandeep Alias Sukha Alias Deepi, who was also not named in the FIR and his name was disclosed subsequently, in the supplementary statement and he was also armed with kapa, said co-accused Sandeep Alias Sukha Alias Deepi has already been released on bail, vide order dated 27.11.2024 in CRM-M-52774-2024 by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court (Annexure P-4).

Thus, counsel submits that plea of bail of the petitioner is required to be treated on parity with that of Sandeep Alias Sukha Alias Deepi.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that though factually there is nothing much to dispute as has been argued by counsel for the petitioner, however, petitioner is involved in three other criminal cases also and therefore, plea of bail of the petitioner cannot be considered at par with that of his co-accused Sandeep Alias Sukha Alias Deepi.

4. I have heard the submissions of the respective counsels and by noticing the same, find that; once petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name is disclosed subsequently in the supplementary statement, that too, after a period of 20 days and similarly situated co-accused Sandeep Alias Sukha Alias Deepi has already been granted bail vide order dated 27.11.2024 in CRM-M-52774-2024 by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court (Annexure P-4) and out of the total 18 prosecution witnesses cited in the final report, only 01 prosecution witness has been examined till date and petitioner is there inside the jail since 23.08.2024,



I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.
Petitioner 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.

5. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

6. 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.

7. Petition stands disposed of.

09.07.2025			(SANJAY VASHISTH)
amandeep			JUDGE
	Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No