



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

222

1) CRM-M-26275-2025
Decided on : 17.11.2025

Rajesh @ Kannad . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-23050-2025

Hitesh @ Teshi . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

3) CRM-M-42467-2025

Sonu Ram . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Namit Khanna, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-26275-2025).

Ms. Manpreet, Advocate for
Mr. Siddharth, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-23050-2025).

Mr. Arun Chander Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-42467-2025).

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.
assisted by ASI Krishan Pal, No.1223/KKR.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-26275-2025, CRM-M-23050-2025, and CRM-M-42467-2025, as all the petitions are interconnected

and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-26275-2025.

2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rajesh @ Kannad (petitioner in CRM-M-26275-2025)	465	16.09.2024	109(1), 110, 121(1), 121(2), 132, 190, 191(3), 304, 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959	Kurukshetra University	Kurukshetra
Hitesh @ Teshi (petitioner in CRM-M-23050-2025)					
Sonu Ram (petitioner in CRM-M-42467-2025)					

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that allegation against the petitioners is that they were part of the un-lawful assembly, however, no specific role was attributed to any of the petitioners. Further contend that initially petitioners were not named in the FIR, however, subsequently on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, names of present petitioners have been involved.

3. Learned counsel submit that case of the present petitioners is on better footings than the co-accused Vansh and Ajay Kumar alias Aje Kumar, who have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide orders dated 24.04.2025, passed in CRM-M-4054-2025, and 23.05.2025, passed in 27570-2025 (appended as Annexures P-2 & P-3, respectively in CRM-M-42467-2025) and on similar footings with the co-accused, Krishan @ Kaku and Suraj, who have also been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 15.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-35780-2025, and 21.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-37172-2025 (appended as Annexures P-4 & P-5,

respectively in CRM-M-42467-2025).

4. Learned counsel further submits that there are three injuries suffered by the injured/complainant – Prince Kumar. Injury No.1 & 3 are simple in nature and only injury No.2 is declared as dangerous to life. The details of three injuries are as under:-

- “i) TWO L/W OF SIZE 5 X 07 CM and 2.5 X 0.3 cm PRESENT OVER LEFT OCCIPITAL REGION OF SCALP WITH FRESH BLEEDING SEEN ADV NCCT HEAD AND SURGEON OPINION.
- ii) STAB wound OF SIZE 4.5 X 2.5 CM PRESENT OVER LEFT SIDE OF LOWER ABDOMEN ADV USE ABDOMEN/NCCT ABDOMEN AND SURGEON OPINION
- iii) RED ABRASION OF SIZE 3 X 2 CM PRESENT OVER MIDDLE 1/3RD PART OF LEFT LEG ANTERIORLY ADV X RAY AND ORTHO OPINION.”

5. Injury No. 2, which has been categorized as *dangerous to life*, has been specifically attributed to the main accused, Pardeep, who allegedly inflicted the knife injury upon the victim. Petitioners – Rajesh @ Kannad, Hitesh @ Teshi and Sonu Ram, are in custody since, 23.09.2024, 21.09.2024 and 17.09.2024, respectively, and are not alleged to have played a graver role than the main accused. Therefore, they are also entitled to the concession of regular bail on the ground of parity, and even on better footings than then other co-accused (mentioned here-above).

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that petitioners, being the members of an unlawful assembly, are not entitled to be released on bail. It is contended that the knife injury was caused by co-accused – Pardeep.

It is further submitted that the investigation has been completed and the challan has already been filed before the Trial Court. However, the process of recording evidence is yet to commence. The other factual aspects

as stated above are not disputed by learned State counsel.

7. Heard.

8. After noticing the contention of both the sides and after going through the averments made in the petition, this Court finds that the main/grievous injury has been attributed to the main accused, Pardeep, with a knife, and in the FIR also, no specific role has been attributed to either of the present petitioners. However, they have been involved in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements, therefore, the complicity of the petitioners is to be ascertained at the final stage of the trial.

Besides, after completion of investigation, challan has also been submitted. Therefore, considering the totality of circumstances, and the nature of allegations leveled against the petitioners, and the factors noted here-above, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

9. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

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

11. 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.

Petitions stand disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 17, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*