



CRM-M-45743 of 2025

-1-

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

220

CRM-M-45743 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

Vikash

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pardeep Panwar, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.221 dated 22.07.2024 registered under Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 304, 324(4), 333 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 304 of BNS were deleted and Sections 111(2)(b), 111(3), 115(2), 309(4) and 61(2) of BNS were added), at Police Station Narwana Sadar, District Jind.

2. The case was registered on the statement of one Karambir Nain, who stated that the petitioner along with other 18/20 boys, all armed with sticks, trespassed into his liquor shop at village Dhakal. Money was snatched from salesman Vikas after causing him injuries and after damaging



the articles lying in the shop, all the accused fled from the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He is behind bars since 18.03.2025. The investigation in this case is complete and challan also stands presented. He has also submitted that with the intervention of the members of the society, the parties have decided to bury their past disputes and compromised the matter amicably. It has also been contended that that after the amicable settlement, co-accused Naveen Kumar has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 21.08.2025. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, has opposed the prayer for bail, stating that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He further submitted that he is not aware about compromise if any between the parties. However, he has duly acknowledged the factum of custody that the petitioner is in custody for more than 05 months.

5. However, learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise and submits that he has no objection if the present petition is allowed.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented, and the trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody especially when a compromise has been effected between the parties. Keeping the petitioner in

**CRM-M-45743 of 2025****-3-**

further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.09.2025*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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