



225

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

CRM-M-8347-2025**Date of Decision: 19.02.2025**

Yashvir Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Sachin Bhardwaj, 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.368 dated 09.08.2024 registered under Sections 115, 333, 109(1), 118(1), 118(2) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Meenakshi wife of Bhupendra and the same has been reproduced below:-

*“To SHO Sahib, Police Station City Narnaul.
Subject- Complaint regarding breaking into the house and
attacking with a knife. Sir, I am Meenakshi wife of Bhupendra
resident of Mohd. Chanduwada and do domestic work. Today
on the night of 8/9.08.2024, I and my husband were sleeping in our
house with our children, at around 11/11:15 PM, an unknown
person entered our house and when we raised an alarm and tried
to catch him, he attacked my husband with a sharp weapon which*



was like a knife, due to which my husband got seriously injured and when I raised an alarm, he ran away and when the people of the locality came, I took my husband to the hospital which is a government hospital in Narnaul. The doctor prepared my husband's MLR and seeing his serious condition referred him to a Higher Centre, after which I took my husband to NIMS HOSPITAL JAIPUR, where he is undergoing treatment. Some unknown person entered my house and attacked my husband. Legal action should be taken against him. - Sd- Meenakshi Applicant Meenakshi wife of Bhupendra resident of Chanduwada Ward no. 24.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR nor any such physical description was mentioned in the FIR, which even remotely connects the petitioner with the crime. He further contends that the petitioner and the complainant were known to each other and still the petitioner was not named in the present case. Rather, the petitioner has been involved in the present case by the complainant due to some previous enmity. He further contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, the petitioner had caused an injury with knife on the left elbow of husband of the complainant and the said injury has been declared to be dangerous to life. However, the injured has already been discharged from the hospital and is hale and hearty. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 15.10.2024 and challan has already been presented against him.

4. 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.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months and after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented against him. Even though, the petitioner is attributed an injury, which attracted the offence under Section 307 IPC, but the petitioner cannot be permitted to languish in jail for an indefinite period.

7. 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.

19.02.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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