



CRM-M-14378-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-14378-2025

Date of Decision: 01.05.2025

Manpreet @ Manni

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.44 dated 08.02.2024 under Section 148, 149, 323, 325, 308, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Bilaspur, Yamunanagar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Parvinder Singh. It was alleged that on 07.02.2024 at about 02:15 p.m., the complainant went to Balaji Service and Washing Center, Bilaspur to get his car washed. When he was sitting in the washing center, two boys came on motorcycle and asked Satvindra to get their motorcycle washed and about 5-7 minutes thereafter, a Swift Car came from Jagadhri side and stopped. Gurneet @ Dinnu came out of the car, who was holding an iron rod in his hands. The two boys who came on motorcycle caught hold him and Gurneet @ Dinnu alongwith 6-7 boys duly armed, came to him. Gurneet @ Dinnu hit the complainant on his head with iron rod and others also gave injuries to him. The complainant was shifted to the Civil Hospital, Yamunanagar. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the



investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was found and thus, he was arrested on 13.05.2024. He approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 28.02.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that neither the petitioner named in the FIR nor any overt act has been attributed to him, however, he has been arrayed as an accused on the basis of bald allegations. He submits that though the complainant has received injuries, but the same are attributed to the co-accused and not the petitioner. He submits that during the investigation, car of the petitioner has been allegedly shown to be used in the crime, which is totally false. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars since the date of his arrest. He submits that all the material witnesses have been examined. He submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused has played an active role in the commission of offence. He submits that during the investigation, a car was recovered, which was used by the assailants, owned by the petitioner. On instructions

from ASI Manish Kumar, he has submitted that out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined and thus, there is no case is made out for the grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, however, during the investigation, he has been arrayed as an accused. The allegations against the petitioner is said to be that his car was used during the commission of offence. As submitted before this Court, out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined including the injured. As reflected from the custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 11 months & 19 days as on 01.05.2025.

6. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

01.05.2025

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No