



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

CRM-M-45722-2025
Date of decision: 26.08.2025

SACHIN

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Vikram Rana, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.23, dated 27.01.2025, registered at Police Station Badhra, Charkhi Dadri under Sections 115, 190, 191(2), 191(3), 333, 351(2), 61 of BNS, 2023.

2. The present case registered on the basis of complaint given to the Police by Ravinder alias Babbal with the allegations that he along with one Pawan alias Jitender had purchased 4 acres of land in the year 2019 in Village Bhandwa on Lohari Road, Badhra Road in equal shares. However, Jitender alias Pawan had inducted five more partners in his share, namely, Dinesh, Suresh, Dinesh son of Ishwar, Sombir and Vijay and for the last 7-8 months, who were raising a dispute and were claiming the valuable portion to be in their ownership. On 24.01.2025 at about 03:40 PM, he along with Dharmender alias Dharma, Manender and



Naresh were sitting in the said plot when about 8 young boys came there, armed with lathis and dandas and caused injuries to him. They proclaimed that they have been sent by Amit resident of Fatehgarh Sahib and threatened him to vacate the land failing which he will be shot dead and he sought action against them. Petitioner was arrested on 02.07.2025.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned State counsel and have gone through the material collected by the police during investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has not been named in the FIR and his name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. Learned counsel further contended that six co-accused namely Rahul, Kirtiman, Narender, Vijay, Jitender @ Pawan and Ritesh Kumar Gupta have already been arrested and released on bail while one co-accused namely Dinesh Kumar released on anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, whose case is identical to that of petitioner and as such, petitioner too is entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity. Learned counsel next contended that all the offences are Magisterial trial and the investigation and trial is likely to take some more time to conclude and his further detention will not serve any useful purpose and he may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner had committed a heinous offence. The petitioner is involved in one more case and he does not deserve the concession of bail.



6. Petitioner is in custody since 02.07.2025 and all the offences are Magisterial trial. Some of the co-accused whose case is identical to that of petitioner have already been released on bail. One co-accused namely Dinesh Kumar has been released on anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. The investigation and trial is likely to take long time to conclude and no useful purpose will thus be served by detaining the petitioner in custody and he deserves to be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

26.08.2025
Priyanka Thakur

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