

2025:PHHC:086551



225 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-1640-2025
Date of Decision: 16.07.2025

Amit Kumar @ Meeta ... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sumit Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Nasir Jamal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Appellant has approached this Court by way of present appeal challenging the impugned order dated 02.04.2025 passed by Ld. Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Judge, Special Court, Kaithal in case FIR No.462 dated 11.11.2024 under Sections 118(1)/126/190/191(3)/351(3) of BNS, 2023 (Subsequently Sections 117(2)/118(2) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(V) and 3(2)(Va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 Act, were added), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Kaithal.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the basis of the statement of the complainant Ajay. It was alleged that he had gone to the house of his friend Akash. On intervening night of 10/11.11.2024,

10-12 boys came into vehicles and they started abusing Akash. Thereafter, those boys namely **Meeta (appellant)**, Sunny, Raman, Dhola and Ramni started beating them. It was alleged that he and his friend were caused injuries by the assailants with their weapons and thus, it was prayed that legal action be taken against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation was commenced. The appellant was arrested on 28.01.2025. The appellant approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Judge, Special Court, Kaithal 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 appellant vide order dated 02.04.2025. Hence, the appellant has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present appeal.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that except making allegations against the appellant, no specific role has been attributed to the appellant in the FIR. Thereafter, with due deliberation, the appellant was assigned the role of causing injury to injured persons. He submits that appellant is behind bars since the date of his arrest i.e. 28.01.2025, however, there is no sufficient progress in the trial. It is submitted that the appellant himself belongs to Scheduled Caste and provisions of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, are not attracted to him. He submits that the matter has already been resolved by way of compromise between both the sides. He, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the appellant deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant affirms the

submissions regarding compromise between the parties. He submits that the dispute arose due to misunderstanding but now the same has been resolved by both the sides.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the appellant. He submits that appellant was duly armed and he has caused injuries to Sandeep and Akash. He submits that the appellant was captured in the CCTV footage as well. On instructions, he submits that investigation is complete. Challan is presented, however, charges are yet to be framed. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the appellant.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the appellant was arrested on 28.01.2025. There was no specific role attributed to the appellant in the FIR. The custody certificate would reflect that the appellant has suffered incarceration of 05 months & 18 days as on 15.07.2025. It further reflects that the appellant is involved in 05 more cases, however, in 04 cases he is on bail and in one case, he has been acquitted.

7. The veracity of the allegations and counter allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. 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 appellant succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the appellant.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. It is being clarified that in case the appellant does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

16.07.2025
Parveen kumar

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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