



CRM-M-25211-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-25211-2025
Decided on : 02.09.2025

Aman

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang , Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of the Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Aman	597	27.09.2024	109(1), 115, 3(5), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 117 (2) of BNS added later on)	Shivaji Colony	Rohtak

2. As per FIR, when complainant-Ghanshyam was standing with petitioner/accused, namely, Aman in the street, Aman (petitioner herein) and Shubham along with two other boys attacked the complainant with sticks and iron road and gave blows on his head and legs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that there being no specific injuries attributed to the petitioner and co-accused, namely, Shubham,

**CRM-M-25211-2025****-2-**

having already been granted bail by the trial Court, the petitioner deserves concession of bail on parity basis. He further submits that till date, out of total 27 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined, whereas the petitioner is inside the jail since 10.12.2024. Even co-accused, Rahul has also been granted bail though, he is facing prosecution before the Juvenile Justice Board being juvenile.

4. He further submits that the incident took place on 26.09.2024 and even after little less than a period of 02 months, thereafter, false and misleading information has been furnished in relation to grievous injuries Nos.1, 2 and 5. It is further contended that the nature of the information provided, though purporting to establish the injuries as grievous, implicitly, indicates that such injuries may not, in fact, be dangerous to life.

5. Learned State counsel appearing on advance notice, refers to medical opinion, as per which injuries No.1, 2 and 5 though are declared griveous in nature and injuries No.3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are simple in nature. Regarding fake information given by the Doctor, which is mentioned as ***‘the possibility of injury No.1 (one), 2 (two) and 5 (five) mentioned in the MLR’*** being dangerous to life cannot be ruled out.

6. Considering all the circumstances and factual position as having been explained by the petitioner not being disputed by the State counsel, this Court does not find any substantial evidence/material to detain petitioner any long, more so, for the reason that the co-accused, namely, Shubham @ Subhi has already been granted concession of bail by the Court below.

7. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

**CRM-M-25211-2025****-3-**

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

02.09.2025
NainaRajput

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**