

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

209

CRM-M-28548-2025

Date of decision: 28.05.2025

Sudhir

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL


Present : Ms. Garima Dikshit, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.59 dated 03.03.2025, under Sections 190, 191, 115, 351(3), 110, 281, 324(6) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that complainant was driving his car and at around 11:50 A.M, the car was hit from behind and after hitting him from behind, the car overtook him and stopped in front of his car and 5 boys came out of the car and offending the complainant told them that they had hit his car following which they started beating the complainant and his brother Yogesh. The petitioner although not named in the FIR, however, he is implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. This incident is a case of road rage as parties are not known to each other. In the present case, *challan* has been presented and petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2025. Learned counsel submits that the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the petitioner be released on regular bail.



3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. However, he submits that petitioner is in custody since 04.03.2025.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel, and the fact that petitioner is in custody for the last 3 months ; *challan* has been filed but trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

28.05.2025
anil

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