

2025:PHHC:131102



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

321

CRM-M No.46102 of 2025
Date of Decision: 22.09.2025

Saurabh ... Petitioner

Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Mukesh Rao, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Jaskirat Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
466	14.06.2025	Barwala, District Hisar	109(1), 115, 126, 190, 191(2), 191(3), 324(6) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (117(2) of BNS and 42(2), 42(3), 42(4) and 42(6) of the Telecommunications Act, 2023 added later on)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of

2025:PHHC:131102



this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant – Balinder alleging that he was doing labour work with contractor Parveen Kumar. On the evening of 13.06.2025, he had gone to do labour work in the plot of one Anil Kumar, resident of Ward No.1, Barwala. They had started doing work of putting lintel on the ground for installing a tower of Indus Company on the plot. Sometime thereafter, the petitioner, who was living in neighbourhood of the above said Anil Kumar reached there along with co-accused and 10-15 persons. They were armed with *dandas*. They told the complainant and others to stop doing the construction work by proclaiming that they would not let any tower installed on that plot. On resistance of owners of the plot, they opened an assault upon them as well as upon the complainant and started causing injuries to them with their respective weapons. Santosh w/o Ram Lal and Chandro, who were present there, also sustained injuries at their hands. Thereafter while extending threats to kill them, the assailants fled from the spot, while causing damage to the grocery shop of Anil Kumar.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner along with co-accused Vijay was arrested on 15.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement and got recovery of a wooden danda effected in pursuance thereof. The co-accused were also arrested and investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has

2025:PHHC:131102



been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of vague allegations. There is delay of more than 24 hours in reporting the matter to the police. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. He is in custody since 15.06.2025. Investigation stands completed. Trial will take time. A compromise has been effected between him and the complainant and the latter has sworn an affidavit Annexure P-11 in this regard. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has not raised any objection to allowing of the petition.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the complainant. As per the medical record, grievous injuries had been sustained by the complainant. None of the injuries so sustained by him and the other injured is, however, opined to be dangerous to life. The petitioner is in custody since 15.06.2025. The trial will take time to conclude. The co-accused Vijay has been extended benefit of bail. In view of the above facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the

2025:PHHC:131102



petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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