



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

206

CRM-M-36734 of 2025
Date of decision: 18.07.2025

Yashpal alias Hunny

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Nitish Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS of 2023 in case FIR No.51 dated 19.02.2024, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 379-B and 506 IPC (later on Sections 120-B, 201, 204 and 367 IPC were added) registered at Police Station Dharuhera, Rewari.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with his co-accused caused injuries to the complainant and his brother which has resulted into several fractures.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per custody certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 3 months and 7 days and trial is yet to commence. He further submits that no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner. Moreover, co-accused of the petitioner have also been released on bail. Trial is likely to take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.
4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, Addl. A. G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 01 year, 03 months and 07 days.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial is yet to commence and the same is likely to take a long time, the continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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.

8. 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 their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.07.2025
anil

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