



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(223) CRM-M-42519-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 16.09.2025

Karan alias Gopi

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Jai Bhagwan, Advocate, for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.88 dated 05.04.2025 under Sections 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118(1) BNS, 2023 and Sections 117(2), 110, 109 BNS, 2023 (added later on) registered at Police Station Kheripul, Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Savita Devi and reads as under:-

To SHO, Police Station Kheripul, Faridabad, Haryana. Sir, it is requested that I, Savita Devi, wife of Nishikant Chauhan, is the resident of 24 Feet Road, Wazirpur, Faridabad. At around 10.15 pm, two groups were fighting in front of my house. In which the name of one was Shivam, Gopal and four to five other people were fighting. My husband and my brother Raghuraj reached home from duty and from outside, my husband asked both the parties to stop fighting and not to quarrel and abuse each other. Then they started fighting with my husband and brother. Then Deva and Shubham etc. attacked upon my husband and brother



with lathi and rod. Then both my sons and I myself came running to save my husband and brother then these people attacked upon me and my husband, brother and children with axes, knives and sharp weapons. We were admitted to the nearest hospital by the people, information of which was given by my brother Sagar dialling 112. Sir, it is requested you to take strict action against all these persons. SD- Name of applicant Savita.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was arrested on 06.04.2024 and only a plastic pipe used in the commission of the offence has been recovered from him. The injuries attributed to him are simple in nature. The injury attracting Section 307 IPC (Section 109 BNS, 2023) on the person of Raghuraj has been attributed to one Jitendra. As the petitioner is in custody since 06.04.2025 but none of the 20 prosecution witnesses has 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 the State, on the other hand, has filed a status report dated 15.09.2025 which is taken on record. While referring to the said report, he alongwith the counsel for the complainant contend that the petitioner and his co-accused caused injuries to multiple persons. Pursuant to his arrest, the recovery of a weapon of offence has also been effected from him. The nature of the allegations levelled against him do not entitle him to the concession of bail. They, however, concede that only simple injuries have been attributed to the petitioner, he is in custody since 06.04.2025 and that none of the 20 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.



5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 06.04.2025 but none of the 20 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required,
7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Karan alias Gopi is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.
8. If any attempt whatsoever is made by the petitioner and/or his family members/friends to contact/threaten/intimidate any of the witnesses of the present occurrence, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.
9. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- 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 petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.
10. The petition stands disposed of.
11. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

September 16, 2025
sukhpreet

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