



221

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

**CRM-M No.46895 of 2025
Date of decision : 26.09.2025**

Parveen Kumar @ Kallu

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate and
Ms. Surekha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, 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.900, dated 26.11.2024, under Sections 110, 118(1), 190, 191(2), 303, 333, 351(2), 115 of BNS, 2023 (Sections 117(2), 238(c), 3(5) BNS added later on and Sections 110, 303, 190, 191(2) BNS have been deleted), registered at Police Station Karnal City, District Karnal.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ashish Kharbanda. It was alleged that on 25.11.2024 at about 10:00 P.M., his brother, namely, Ish and Shikha (his wife) along with 4-5 goons, who were



armed with sharp edged weapons, i.e. sword and Gandasi. They trespassed in their house and opened attack on him and his father. The head of the complainant was bleeding and even his ear was cut with sharp edged weapon. The household articles were damaged and DVR was also taken away by them so as to destroy the evidences. It was alleged that about 04 months back, his father transferred the house in the name of complainant, regarding which the civil suit has been filed by his brother for vacating the house and on account this dispute, brother of complainant had opened attack on him and his father. The request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, he was arrested on 07.01.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.07.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-29603 of 2025 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn as the matter was under investigation vide order dated 01.07.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court again by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in



the present case. He has submitted that from the bare perusal of the FIR, the dispute is among the co-accused, who are the father and sons. He has submitted that the motive of the dispute is the partition of the parental property among two brothers, i.e. the complainant and Ish. He has submitted that the petitioner is not related to the family, however he has been roped in the present case on the allegation that he was friend of Ish. To buttress his arguments, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the persons, who are mainly responsible for the dispute, are the father and sons, who are already on bail. He has submitted that though the petitioner earlier approached this Court for the same relief by way of filing CRM-M-29603 of 2025, however as the matter was under investigation, the same was withdrawn on 01.07.2025. He has submitted that the challan is presented and charges are framed. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 08 months, and thus, in the facts and circumstances, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Status report dated 25.09.2025 by way of an affidavit of Kaanchi Singhal, IPS, Assistant Superintendent of Police, Karnal on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was not only a part of unlawful assembly but he has caused injuries as well along with the co-accused to the complainant and his father. He has submitted that the



petitioner is a habitual offender, who is facing prosecution in various other cases as well. He, on instructions, has submitted that the investigation is complete, challan is presented and the charges are also framed. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute in the present case primarily of a family dispute. Admittedly the petitioner is not related to the family, however he has alleged to be a friend of one of the brothers, i.e. Ish. There are 04 accused in the present FIR, out of which rest of the 03 accused, who had the motive for the dispute, are already on bail. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 08 months and 18 days as on 25.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 06 other cases, however in 04 of the cases, he is on bail.

8. 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, the nature of the case and the allegations made, the Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the 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. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

26.09.2025			(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
<i>rittu</i>	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No