



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-19535-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.09.2025

Laxman

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Narender Singh Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in FIR bearing No.483 dated 13.12.2023, registered under Section 323, 452, 506, 34 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Faridabad Old, District Faridabad.

2. Briefly summarised, the facts of the present case are that FIR was registered on the statement of Madan Lal with the allegations that on 10.12.2023, accused Sunder, Manoj with other unknown persons came to his house and beaten his son-Ravi, when his wife and daughter tried to rescue him, they were also pushed by them and after threatening them, they fled away from the spot. As per the opinion of the Doctor, cause of death was the injuries caused by the assailants.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner



had an altercation with deceased-Ravi on account of the pending dues of *Papaya* in which a scuffle arose. He contends that the petitioner has been attributed to have give two punches and kick-blows in the abdomen of deceased-Ravi and apparently, as result of the said injuries there was a perforation ultimately leading septicemia causing the demise of Ravi. He contends that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year 08 months. He submits that out of the total 28 prosecution witnesses cited, no one has been examined so far. It is further submitted that the petitioner does not have any other criminal antecedents.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner has caused the injuries eventfully resulting into the death of the deceased-Ravi. She however is not in a position to dispute actual custody period of the petitioner, the stage of trial as well as non-involvement of the petitioner in any other criminal case.

5. Taking into consideration the period of actual custody being 01 year, 08 months and 15 days, the stage of the trial wherein no one has been examined so far, out of the total 28 prosecution witnesses and that the antecedents of the petitioner, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or



indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

01.09.2025
Mangal Singh

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