



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-51313-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.09.2025

Suraj and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vivek Dahiya, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0171	09.04.2025	Hisar City, District Hisar	115, 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (110 of BNS added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 06.04.2025, the complainant Rohit had gone to attend birthday party of one Akash at a Cafe. The petitioners along with their friends had also joined that party. A verbal altercation had taken place between him and the petitioners. The petitioners and their companions started assaulting him. He had tried to leave that place but

they did not let him go. It was only on intervention of Akash and some other persons that the petitioners and their friends left him. Subsequently, the complainant had called the petitioners who told them to come at their house but on reaching there, they along with the co-accused extended beatings to him, threw a brick over his head and then fled away while extending threats of life. On his complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioners were arrested and are in custody since 28.04.2025. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. They are in custody since 28.04.2025. Investigation stands completed. Challan has been presented. No recovery is to be effected from them. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. Their further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. There is delay of three days in lodging of the FIR. A compromise has even otherwise been effected between the complainant and themselves, which has been placed on record as Annexure P-2. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that he has no objection if the petition is allowed. However, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, while controverting the submissions as made by the petitioners, has argued that there are serious allegations against them and it is urged that keeping in view the gravity of the offence as alleged to be committed by the petitioners, they do not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has heard and considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioners along with the co-accused are alleged to have

assaulted the victim and to have caused injuries on his person. Though a compromise has been effected between them, however, no relevance can be given to the same at this stage. However, at the same time, it is considered that the petitioners are in custody since 28.04.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners in custody any more. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

26.09.2025
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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