

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

2025:PHHC:168079



(220)

CRM-M-43602-2025

Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

Rahul

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present:- Mr. Nitish Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL.J (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.51 dated 19.02.2024, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 379-B and 506 IPC (later on added sections 120-B, 201, 204 & 367 IPC), registered at Police Station Dharuhera, Rewari.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with Harpal Singh gave injuries to the complainant and his brother which resulted in fractures. He submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He submits that one Swift car, one wooden stick along with snatched mobile phone have been recovered from the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on

record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 01 year and 09 months as on 01.12.2025. It is submitted that petitioner is involved in some other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He, upon instructions, submits that charges have been framed on 19.04.2025, however, none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In view of the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 09 months in the present case. Although, petitioner is involved in some other cases, however, he has been granted bail in those cases. Out of the 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date, therefore the trial is likely to take a long time, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as his continuous detention would not serve the ends of justice.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

02.12.2025
lucky

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No