

2025:PHHC:053351



207.

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

CRM-M-8846-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.04.2025

Sahil alias Jimmwer

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-6527-2025

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CRM-M-8846-2024

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. (483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.295, dated 29.11.2024, under Sections 115, 118(1), 190, 191(3), 351(2), 351(3) of IPC (Section 109 of BNS added lateron), registered at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.01.2025. Not only is the investigation complete and challan presented but subsequent to the registration of the FIR, the parties have ironed out their differences and amicably settled the dispute. Learned counsel has still further submitted that even on merits, it is

submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR in question; he came to be nominated as an accused pursuant to a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by the other co-accused, however, therein also, it has been vaguely submitted that the petitioner had slapped the injured.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has not disputed the custody period nor has it been disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete.

4. At this stage, Ms. Kashish Saini, Advocate, has caused appearance and filed *vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record. Learned counsel for the complainant has not disputed that the matter stands amicably settled between the parties and, therefore, the complainant would have no objection to the petitioner being extended the concession of bail.

5. Learned State counsel, however, has submitted, on instructions, that in the disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused, the petitioner had only been attributed slaps on the person of the injured, however, after the petitioner was arrested, he suffered a disclosure statement that he had assaulted the injured with an iron rod. Learned State counsel has also submitted that in the disclosure statement of one of the co-accused, it had been claimed that the petitioner was armed with an iron rod and had been inflicted injuries on the person of the injured, although no recovery, pursuant to any of the disclosure statements including that of the petitioner, was made.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. The petitioner has been in custody since 24.01.2025. The investigation in the present case is complete. The trial in the case would take considerable time to conclude. Even otherwise, the matter has been compromised between the parties. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars anymore.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 25, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No