



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

CRM-M-23156-2025

Reserved on: 1st August, 2025

Pronounced on: 8th August, 2025

Jatin Bhatia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Shweta Nahata, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 593 dated 04.12.2023 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323 and 506 of IPC (Section 325, 307 and 379-B of IPC added later on) at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.

2. As per the prosecution case, on the night of 29.11.2023, the victim Vikas, son of the complainant Suman, was present outside his shop with Rajan, Mohit and Iqbal, when the petitioner reached there along with co-accused Banwari and started asking him the reason for accompanying one Iqbal to Police Station Saran. An altercation had taken place between them but with intervention of friends of Vikas, the petitioner and his accomplices had left. Sometime thereafter, accused Banwari called the victim Vikas to his office on the pretext of getting a compromise effected. When he reached there, then the petitioner accompanied by the co-accused and some unknown persons opened an assault upon the victim Vikas and caused injuries to him with the respective weapons, which they were having.



The friends of his son tried to save him but they were extended threats. Thereafter, on noticing the critical condition of the victim, co-accused Banwari got him admitted in Escort Fortis Hospital. Initially, a case under Sections 148, 323 and 506 read with Section 149 of IPC was registered. Subsequently, on the basis of statement of victim, offences under Sections 307, 325 and 379-B of IPC were added. The accused Amit was arrested on 11.12.2023. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered the weapons of offence and the vehicle used at the time of occurrence. The statement of victim Vikas was recorded on 07.12.2023 and on the basis of same, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 06.01.2025 and was interrogated. He suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he had given kicks and fist blows to the victim, whereas the accused Amit, Banwari and Chaliya had struck blows with iron ice pick to the victim Akash. Investigation stands completed and the petitioner along with some of the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. The statement of injured was recorded after a gap of seven days from the date of incident. There is unexplained delay in reporting the matter to the police. He has clean antecedents. He is in custody since 06.01.2025. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are grave allegations against the petitioner. The victim had sustained serious injuries on vital parts which were opined to be dangerous



to life. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and, in prosecution of common object of that assembly to have caused injuries to the victim Vikas. The injuries, which had been opined to be dangerous to life and were sustained by the victim, have not, however, been attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner does not have criminal antecedents. He is in custody since long. There is no basis for the contention that he will intimidate the witnesses or will abscond. He has permanent abode. Keeping in view the above mentioned facts and peculiar circumstances and the part attributed by the petitioner, but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

8th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*