

2025.PHHC:120569



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

CRM-M-36263-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 27.08.2025

Pronounced on : 05.09.2025

Harish @ Harsh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Saurav Gumbal, Advocate and
Mr. Sumit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Kanupriya Grewal, Advocate and
Ms. Tanya Vashist, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 54 dated 24.02.2025, registered under Sections 190, 191(3), 115(2), 351(3), 109(1), 62(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Amit alleging therein that on 23.02.2025, he was sitting outside the photographer shop of his brother in village Babyal. His friend Sahil was also sitting inside. In the meanwhile, the petitioner accompanied by co-accused Sumit Mehra, Vansh and Gaurav along with 15-20 other companions

2025.PHHC.120569



unknown to the complainant reached there armed with weapons. They started hurling abuses to the complainant, on hearing which, Sahil came outside the shop and then the assailants opened attack upon both of them with an intent to kill them. Both of them sustained injuries. Accused Vishal Sonkar fired 4-5 shots with some firearm injury upon them but they had a narrow escape. Thereafter, they fled away from the spot while extending threats to the lives of both of them. They were admitted in the hospital. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and co-accused Rajesh @ Vansh were arrested on 27.02.2025. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime and demarcated the place of occurrence. Co-accused were also arrested subsequently. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been presented.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No specific overt act or injury has been attributed to him. The injuries sustained by the complainant has been opined to be simple in nature. The petitioner is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. Co-accused Sahil has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves the same benefit. He does not have any criminal antecedents. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Hence, it is urged that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations

2025.PHHC.120569



levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have caused injuries to the complainant and victim with intent to kill them. Investigation now stands completed. Trial would take considerable time to conclude as even charges have not been framed. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. No specific injury had been attributed to him. Co-accused Sahil has already been granted concession of bail. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations, the part played by the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and 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.

7. 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.

05.09.2025*Parveen Sharma***(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*