



234+293

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.43257 of 2025

Parveen @ Sonu

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.44619 of 2025

Rohit @ Jagira

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

Date of decision: 04.11.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-44619-2025.

Mr. V. P. Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-43257-2025.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, 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.0202, dated 06.08.2024, under Sections 115, 126, 3(5), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 117(2), 109(1), 61(2), 190, 191(2), 191(3) and 351(3) of BNS added and Sections 3(5), 351(2) of BNS deleted during investigation), registered at Police Station Dadri City, District Charkhi Dadri.



3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case has been got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ravi Parkash. It was alleged that on 06.08.2024, the complainant along with his brother, namely, Harsh had gone to the Court at Charkhi Dadri and when they were returning, they were way laid by Mohit, Rohit @ Jagira (petitioner in CRM-M-44619-2025), Rohit @ Mehsha Ala. It was alleged that they stopped their vehicles. The complainant was taken out from the vehicle in which he was travelling. They caused injuries to the complainant with sticks, however he was rescued by his brother, namely, Harsh and friend, namely, Vikas. However, after causing injuries, they left the spot by threatening them. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The complainant was medico legally examined. The petitioner, namely, Rohit @ Jagira (in CRM-M-44619-2025) was arrested on 04.11.2024. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner, namely, Parveen @ Sonu (in CRM-M-43257-2025) surfaced and thus, he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, he was arrested on 06.11.2024. Both the petitioners approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri declined both the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide orders dated 17.01.2025 and 28.07.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner, namely, Parveen @ Sonu (in CRM-M-43257-2025) earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-18510-2025 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 26.05.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the



petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have submitted that the alleged occurrence in the present case had taken place on 06.08.2024 whereas the offence under Section 109 BNS has been added on 17.08.2024. They have submitted that the ocular version is not medically corroborated. They have submitted that the offence under Section 109 of BNS has been added only to make the case a serious one, however from the facts and circumstances and the medical record, no offence as alleged is made out. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest. They have submitted that though the petitioners are involved in other cases, however they are on bail in those cases. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

5. Status reports dated 27.10.2025 in both the petitions by way of an affidavit of Dheeraj Kumar, HPS, DSP, HQ, Charkhi Dadri on behalf of the respondent-State have been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court and the same are taken on record. Copies thereof have been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsels for the petitioners. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been established from the CCTV footage recovered from the scene of occurrence. He, on instructions from ASI Anil Kumar, has submitted that out of total 04 injuries suffered, 03 injuries were declared to be grievous



and there was no medical opinion sought for adding the offence under Section 109 of BNS, however the same has been added on the opinion of the Investigating officer, who has observed that if the proper medical treatment would not have been given at the appropriate time, it could have been dangerous to life. He has submitted that out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have already been examined. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

7. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 06.08.2024 and the offence under Section 109 of BNS has been added on 17.08.2024. Perusal of the MLR would show that the complainant has suffered injuries on his hands and legs. It has been vehemently contended before this Court that the offence under Section 109 of BNS is not made out in the facts and circumstances, however the Court would refrain from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioner, namely, Parveen @ Sonu (in CRM-M-43257-2025) has suffered incarceration of 11 months and 28 days and the petitioner, namely, Rohit @ Jagira (in CRM-M-44619-2025) has suffered incarceration of 01 year as on 03/04.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Parveen @ Sonu (in CRM-M-43257-2025) is involved in 04 other cases, however in 03 of the cases, he is on bail, whereas the petitioner, namely, Rohit @ Jagira (in CRM-M-44619-2025) is involved in 02 other cases, however he

is not on bail in those cases. 07 witnesses have been examined, out of total 14 prosecution witnesses.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

10. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail.

11. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners, namely, Parveen @ Sonu and Rohit @ Jagira 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. However, 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 cases.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

04.11.2025

<i>rittu</i>	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No