



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

**CRM-M No.38312 of 2025 (O&M)
Reserved on: 15.10.2025
Date of Decision:28.10.2025**

Ravi @ Ravi Malik

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued By: Mr.Baljeeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Atul Dhankar, Advocate for

Mr. Bijender Dhankar, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 148, 149, 302, 341 of IPC [Section 120-B IPC added later on] and Section 25 of Arms Act, the FIR No.110 dated 07.02.2023, has been lodged in Police Station Sector 58, District Faridabad. The petitioner has been arrested in the above mentioned case as an accused. Since the petitioner is in custody, he has filed the present petition for the benefit of bail. This is second petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of bail.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being on a complaint submitted by Balwant son of Mohan Lal who alleged that Vipin the deceased was his nephew and that he was a student of 11th class in Rawal International School Sector 56, Faridabad.



According to complainant, after school when Vipin had to return home he along his sister Neha took lift on the motorcycle of Akash and that on the way 7-8 persons, riding on two motorcycles and a scooty, intercepted them and launched an attack upon Vipin and inflicted injuries on his person with the help of knife. It was also stated by the complainant that his nephew was also thrashed brutally by the above named assailants. According to complainant, he was working in the neighbouring field and when his nephew Vipin cried for help he rushed to the spot and witnessed that his nephew was being thrashed by the assailants. According to complainant, his nephew had disclosed the name of assailants as Sachin Thakur, Vishal, Naveen, Abhishek and Shivam etc. and that later on his nephew passed away.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case, was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution during the course of investigation when accused Sachin was arrested he suffered a disclosure statement and disclosed that one of the assailants was Ravi, i.e. the petitioner.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is innocent who has been simply roped up on the basis of disclosure statement of his co-accused. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a lot of incarceration for being in custody for a period of almost 2 years and 09 months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and therefore, the petitioner should not be kept behind the bar and he is entitled for bail.



6. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that there is direct nexus between the commission of offence and the petitioner, and that the present case is based on eye-witness account wherein the statement of eye-witness can easily prove the identity of petitioner as one of the assailants. During the course of argument, it has been highlighted by the learned State counsel that the present petition is the second petition for bail moved by the petitioner and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstances has taken place. According to learned State counsel all the grounds taken in the present petition have already been dealt with, on merits, in the former bail petition, and therefore, the present petition warrants dismissal.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that the petitioner had approached this Court, for bail on earlier occasion also and the co-ordinate Bench after considering the merits of the case dismissed the petition for bail moved by the petitioner on 30.07.2024. From the date of dismissal of above mentioned petition, no significant change in relevant circumstance is notable, and therefore, it is hereby held the present petition for bail is not maintainable. Thus, it is hereby held that present petition deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

28.10.2025
Manoj Bhutani

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