

2025.PHHC:132912



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

234

CRM-M-28189-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.09.2025

Sonu**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Arun Chander Sharma, Advocate
For the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 331 dated 12.11.2024, registered under Sections 115, 190, 191(3) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 109(1) of BNS, 2023 added later on) at Police Station Safidon, District Jind.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint moved by complainant Maha Singh alleging that in the evening of 11.11.2024, a scuffle had taken place between the petitioner and one Sawan at bus stand of his village and his son Praveen had intervened in the matter. Thereafter, Praveen had come back to his house. In the intervening night of 11-12.11.2024, the petitioner along with co-accused came outside the house of the complainant and asked him to send Praveen outside the house. The complainant told him to come in the morning. Then all of them started extending beatings to him. The family members of the complainant had also woken up in the meanwhile. The petitioner and other assailants criminally

2025.PHHC:132912



trespassed into his house while being armed with weapons and caused injuries to the family members of the complainant as well. On clamour being raised by them, the assailant fled away while extending threats to kill them. The complainant identified six of them and disclosed their names as well.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. As per medico-legal report, one of the injuries sustained by injured Lalit had been opined to be dangerous to life. Offence under Section 109(1) of BNS, 2023 was added. The petitioner was arrested on 02.12.2024. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. He demarcated the place of occurrence and got recovered *danda* used by him. One more assailant namely Sonu son of Ramesh was also arrested. Investigation qua them stands completed and challan has been filed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of one day in lodging of the FIR. He was not the aggressor and in fact it was the members of the complainant party, who were aggressor in this case. The petitioner himself had sustained five injuries in the incident and had given a complaint to the police but no action was taken. He is in custody since long. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

5. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to

2025.PHHC:132912



get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also perused the material placed on record.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common objection thereof, is alleged to have criminally trespassed into the house of the complainant and is further alleged to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the family members of the complainant and himself. One of the injuries sustained by injured Lalit, who is son of the complainant, has been opined to be dangerous to life. However, the same has not been attributed to the petitioner. He is in custody since 02.12.2024. Not even a single witness has been examined so far out of total 12 prosecution witnesses and, therefore, obviously the conclusion of trial would take considerable time. Keeping in view the period spent by the petitioner in custody, his antecedents coupled with the above discussed facts, I am of the considered opinion that a case is made out for release of the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

24.09.2025*Wasim Ansari***(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**Yes/No
Yes/No*