



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

259+261 (two cases)

CRM-M-33529-2025

Date of Decision: 07.07.2025

(1) Rahul

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-33568-2025

(2) Narender

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off two bail petitions, i.e., CRM-M-33529-2025 titled as “**Rahul Vs. State of Haryana**” and CRM-M-33568-2025 titled as “**Narender Vs. State of Haryana**”, whereby, the petitioner(s) have applied for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No.23 dated 27.01.2025 under Sections 115, 190, 191(2), 191(3), 333, 351(2), 61 of BNS (Section 110 and



117(2) of BNS were added latter on) registered at Police Station Badhra, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Ravinder @ Babbal son of Umed Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

“To The SHO Sahib, Police Station Badhra, Charkhi Dadri, Sir, I humbly request that I am Ravinder alias Babbal S/O Umed Singh, resident of village Mahda and I work in land related matters. I and Pawan alias Jitender S/O Rishal Singh, resident of Dhanasari had bought 4 acres of land in the boundary of Bhadra village on Loharu Road Badhra Road in 2019. Both of us were equal shareholders, Jitender alias Pawan made 5 more partners in his share. Dinesh PTI resident Satnali Ka Bas, at present resident of near Mittal Petrol Pump, Suresh S/o Ishwar Master Ji, resident of Dhanasari, Dinesh S/O Ishwar, resident Patuvas, Sombir S/O Chhallu Ram, resident Bhopali, Vijay S/O Vidyanand, resident Hansavas Khurd have been made partners. From about 7/8 months, all the above partners were arguing about the land of Front. About 4 months ago a rogue named Amit Fatehgarh threatened me over the phone that the land ahead belongs to me and my partners, if you interfere in it, I will kill you. On 24.01.25 at about 3.40 PM 1, Dharmender alias Dharam S/O Ramkan Bhandwa, resident of Bhandwa, Manendra S/O Jaichand Bhandwa, Dharmendra's maternal uncle's son Naresh alias Sonu S/O Devender, resident of Bhiwani Shanti Nagar, Dharmender and myself were sitting in



our plot when suddenly 8 young boys came to us with sticks and asked who is Babbal. I said I am Babal, on which all of them started beating me with sticks and beat me badly and said that Amit Fatehgarh has sent us and if we do not vacate this land immediately we will shoot you. After this all of them fled in 2 cars, i-20 and Swift car. This attack was carried out by Amit Fatehgarh, Jitender alias Pawan, Suresh Dhanasari, Dinesh Patuwas, Sombir Bhopali, Vijay Hansavas Khurd, Dinesh Satnali Ka Bas (Dadri), Sandeep Dhani Surja and seven-eight unknown people by hatching a conspiracy to grab my land. You are requested to take strict legal action against all the above accused. Sd/- Ravinder, Applicant Ravinder s/o Umed Singh, resident of Mehda Charkhi Dadri, 9813477393, 27.01.2025.”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that in the present case, it has been alleged that the petitioner(s) were also seen in the CCTV footage, but the DVR of the said footage has not been collected by the police. The petitioner(s) were neither named in the FIR nor any role was assigned to them. Even the complainant/injured suffered 05 injuries on his person and out of 05 injuries, 04 injuries have been declared to be simple in nature. The petitioner(s) were arrested in the present case on 02.02.2025 and are in custody for the last more than 05 months. He next contends that the challan has already been presented against the petitioner(s) and they are not in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that 10 more cases were ordered to be registered against Narender, whereas 05 more cases were ordered to be registered against Rahul and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that co-accused Kirtiman, Jitender @ Pawan, Dinesh Kumar and Vijay have been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders Annexures P-2 to P-5 respectively.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioners have stated to be in custody since 02.02.2025. Even his co-accused, Kirtiman, Jitender @ Pawan and Vijay have been granted the concession of regular bail, whereas, Dinesh Kumar has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner(s) will not serve any useful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person



acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade their to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioner(s) shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioner(s) shall not absent themselves from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioner(s) shall surrender their passports, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case they are not holder of the same, they shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioner(s) shall also file their affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by them during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, they shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioner(s) are involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner(s).

8. In case, the petitioner(s) violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of

bail granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

07.07.2025
vipin

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

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE