

248+260

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.37762 of 2025

Sachin @ Golu

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.56462 of 2025

Vickey @ Sonu

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

Date of decision: 27.11.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amit Khari, Advocate
for the petitioner in both the petitions.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.

2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.0219, dated 25.08.2021, under Sections 148, 149 & 307 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Sections 212 & 120-B added later on), registered at Police Station Kosli, District Rewari.

3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present



case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Yashdev S/o Ashok Kumar. It was alleged that on 25.08.2021 at about 2:30 P.M., the complainant and Akshay were standing in front of the office of Bhupender, resident of Bhakli. In the meantime, a motorcycle came from the side of Shalawas, on which Himanshu and two other boys were riding. Thereafter, 03 other motorcycles came, on which Deepak, Golu @ Sachin (petitioner in CRM-M-37762-2025), Vicky @ Dacoit (petitioner in CRM-M-56462-2025), Parvesh and 04-05 other boys were riding and they left towards village Bhakli. After some time, all 04 motorcycles came back and they stopped near them. Himanshu, Deepak, Golu (petitioner in CRM-M-37762-2025), Parvesh, Daku Sahlwas and 06 other boys got down. Himanshu, Deepak and Golu (petitioner in CRM-M-37762-2025) pointed the pistols towards them and all 03 of them started firing at them with intention to kill. In order to save himself, the complainant ran towards the farm and Himanshu also ran after him. The commotion attracted the public and on seeing the public coming there, they fled away on their motorcycles. It was alleged that he was having enmity with Himanshu and Deepak. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioners were arrested on 15.11.2021 and 01.01.2022. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari praying for the grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari declined the bail applications filed by both the petitioners vide orders dated 23.05.2025 and 02.06.2025, respectively. Hence being



aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Parveen Kumar. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 18.02.2025 passed in **CRM-M No.64978 of 2024**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Parveen Kumar has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest and thus, has suffered an incarceration of more than 3½ years. He has submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail as the cases of the petitioners are similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

5. Reply dated 26.11.2025 in CRM-M-37762-2025 by way of an affidavit of Vidyanand, DSP, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kosli, Rewari on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioners as stated above and has not denied that the petitioners are at par with the co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Parveen Kumar. He has submitted that the petitioners are involved in other cases as well. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.




7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case had taken place on 25.08.2021. The petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 15.11.2021 and 01.01.2022. Co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Parveen Kumar is already on bail and the cases of the petitioners as stated are at par with him. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioner, namely, Sachin @ Golu has suffered incarceration of 04 years and 12 days whereas the petitioner, namely, Vicky @ Sonu has suffered incarceration of 03 years, 10 months and 26 days as on 26.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Sachin @ Goli is involved in 03 other cases, however in 01 case, he is on bail, whereas the petitioner, namely, Vicky @ Golu is involved in 09 other cases, however in 04 cases, he has been acquitted and in 01 case, he is on bail.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners on parity.

10. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners, namely, Sachin @ Golu and Vicky @ Sonu are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of



the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. If the petitioners do not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then their further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

27.11.2025
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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