



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

**CRM-M No.45800 of 2025
Date of decision: 13.11.2025**

Ranjeet

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Soeb Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.273, dated 27.06.2022, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 506, 302, 201, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station SGM Nagar, District Faridabad.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Vikas. It was alleged therein that on 26.06.2022 at about 7:00 PM, he along with Deepak and Vinod were standing near liquor shop, In the meantime, Amar Chand, Mangal, Prem, Golu, Chintu, Gheta and 10-12 other persons reached there carrying iron rods, swords and dandas in their hands and caused grievous injuries to Deepak with the weapons carried by them. It was further alleged that after considering Deepak to be dead, all the assailants fled away from the spot giving threat that in case Deepak survived, they would kill him in future. The whole occurrence was captured in CCTV cameras installed there. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the



investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 05.09.2022. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 28.07.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-973-2024 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 30.05.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been surfaced in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders passed by this Court in **CRM-M-32153-2025** dated 04.11.2025, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Rahul @ Balori has been granted bail by this Court. He thus, submits that the case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He, on



instructions, has submitted that complicity of the petitioner has been surfaced during the investigation. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record. However, he has endorsed the fact that co-accused of petitioner, namely, Rahul @ Balori, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 04.11.2025 passed in **CRM-M-32153-2025**.

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

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioner was not named in the FIR, however, he has been arrayed as an accused during the investigation. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 03 years, 02 months and 08 days as on 12.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases, out of which, in one case he is on bail and in one case he has been acquitted. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Rahul @ Balori, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 04.11.2025 passed in **CRM-M-32153-2025**. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

7. 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.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC*

695 has held as under:



“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

9. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in ‘**Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024**’, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.
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 petitioner succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with the co-accused as stated above.
11. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his 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.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.11.2025
ps-I

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