

2025:PHHC:149758



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.41763 of 2025
Date of Decision: 31.10.2025
Reserved on: 27.10.2025

Shiva alias Taki ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Deepak Grover, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
201	23.04.2025	Sector-58, District Faridabad, Haryana	109(1), 115, 118(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. As per the allegations, on 01.03.2025, the petitioner along with co-accused Neeraj @ Sapola, Amar @ Chippa and some unknown persons came to the house of the complainant and asked about the whereabouts of her husband Sher Singh. The complainant asked them as

2025:PHHC:149758



to what had happened and then they had started hurling abuses to her. Accused Neeraj @ Sapola struck blows with knife, accused Amar @ Chippa struck blows with danda and the petitioner struck blows with a plastic pipe on her neck. She sustained injuries and raised clamour on hearing which, a crowd had gathered there and then the assailants fled away while extending threat to kill her. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 25.04.2025. He suffered disclosure statement and got recovered a plastic pipe alleged to be used by him in the crime. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case due to party friction. He did not cause any injury to the complainant. The injury that has been opined to be dangerous to life on the person of the complainant has not been attributed to him. He is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who along with the co-accused had caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the victim and one of these injuries has been opined to be dangerous to life. He is a habitual offender being involved in three more cases. There are chances of his absconding, intimidating the witnesses or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is,

2025:PHHC:149758



therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have assaulted the victim and caused injuries to her by striking blows with a plastic pipe. The injury No.2 as found on the person of the victim was opined to be dangerous o life but the same was not attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 25.04.2025. There is no likelihood of the conclusion of trial in near future. The continued detention of the petitioner will not serve any fruitful purpose. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a cause for denying benefit of bail to him. In view of the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and further subject to his abiding by the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by specific order of the Court.

(ii) The petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is an accused.

(iii) The petitioner 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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police

2025:PHHC:149758



officer.

7. In the eventuality of breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to move an application seeking cancellation of the bail.

31.10.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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