



CRM-M-41610-2025

-1-

(227+235)

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

CRM-M-41610-2025

Date of Decision: 03.11.2025

RAHUL

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CRM-M-49783-2025

WAHEED

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ankit Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-41610-2025.

Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Lovish Sorout, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-49783-2025.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CRM-M-41610-2025 titled as Rahul Versus State of Haryana and CRM-M-49783-2025 titled as Waheed Versus State of Haryana as the same are arising out of the same FIR. However, for the sake of convenience the facts have been taken from CRM-M-41610-2025.

**CRM-M-41610-2025****-2-**

2. The prayer in the present petitions under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.79 dated 21.04.2022 registered under Sections 147, 149, 323, 341, 406, 427 & 506 IPC (Section 302 IPC added later on) at Police Station Bahin.

3. The learned Senior counsel for Waheed (petitioner in CRM-M-49783-2025) contends that as per the case of the prosecution a simple injury has been attributed to the petitioner on the of person of Ali Jan. As the petitioner is in custody since February, 2025 but only 05 of the 36 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for Rahul (petitioner in CRM-M-41610-2025) also contends that as per the prosecution case, only simple injuries on the person of Jahul have been attributed to the petitioner. As the petitioner is in custody since February, 2025 but only 05 of the 36 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he too is entitled to the concession of bail.

5. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that all the accused found an unlawful assembly causing injuries to multiple persons and the death of Imrat. Therefore, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners do not entitle them to the concession of bail. He however, concedes that the injury on the deceased has been attributed to Nisar, that the petitioners have been attributed simple injuries, that they are in

**CRM-M-41610-2025****-3-**

custody since February 2025 and that only 05 of the 36 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. Admittedly, the petitioners have only been attributed simple injuries on Ali Jan and Jahul respectively. Their culpability with the aid of Section 149 IPC, if any, shall be established during the course of the trial. They have been in custody since February 2025, but only 05 of the 36 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, their further incarceration is not required.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioners (or anyone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petitions stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

03.11.2025

Kusum

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