

2025:PHHC:170279



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.56807 of 2025
Date of Decision: 08.12.2025

Arun alias Nada ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

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
182	27.06.2024	Dadri Sadar, District Charkhi Dadri	506, 341, 323, 307, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC and 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (325 of IPC added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 26.06.2024, complainant Karambir along with his companions Sahil and Sachin had gone to Dadri on his pick up vehicle and had unloaded shuttering material from his vehicle and then all three of them were going towards Fatehgarh. When they reached near village Sahawas, they were intercepted by two youths, who

2025:PHHC:170279



came riding a bike. The complainant identified one of them as Sachin @ Rot. He fired a shot towards Sahil with an intent to kill him. Thereafter, co-accused Ravinder Makdana, Nitin Datoli, Ramnath, Sharvan, Dharma and 2-3 unknown persons also reached there. All of them were armed with weapons. They damaged the window panes of the vehicle of the complainant and made Sahil alight from the vehicle. One of them asked accused Sachin to kill Sahil to take revenge for Kala Khetan. All of them started extending beatings to Sahil with iron rods and dandas. The complainant and his companion Sachin concealed themselves in the nearby fields in order to save themselves. When they came out after some time, they found Sahil to be lying in an injured condition on the ground. He was taken to hospital. On the basis of the written complaint filed by the complainant, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, accused Pankaj @ Amarjit and Shivkant @ Nitin were arrested. The accused Shivkant suffered a disclosure statement on 20.09.2024 on the basis of which the present petitioner along with the co-accused Ajay, Ankit, Diksendra Dahiya and Akash were nominated as additional accused. The petitioner was arrested on 08.04.2025. He too suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime by stating that he had caused injuries to the victim with a brick and wooden danda. Co-accused were also arrested. Supplementary challan had been filed against the petitioner and some other accused.

2025:PHHC:170279



been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was neither named in the FIR nor any specific overt act has been attributed to him. Investigation now stands completed. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He is on bail in another case as registered against him and cannot be denied benefit of bail because of that reason. Hence, it is urged that the present petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have assaulted victim Sahil with an intent to kill him. He was not named in the FIR and was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Shivkant. No specific overt act or injury on the person of the victim has been attributed to him. He is in

2025:PHHC:170279



considerable time to conclude. It is well settled that the bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

08.12.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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