



CRM-M-61075-2024

-1-

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

CRM-M-61075-2024

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

SANDEEP @ KAIF

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Bharat Julka, Advocate and
Ms. Sunita Devi Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.505 dated 22.08.2023 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323 and 307 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Hisar.

2. As per the facts of the case, the parties of both the sides are the prisoners and the occurrence had taken place inside the jail. The FIR has been lodged on the statement of a prisoner, namely, Sandeep @ Bangru. It was alleged that on 21.08.2023 at about 7:00 PM when he was in his barrack then Sandeep S/o Pola Ram, Satnam S/o Madan Lal, Saga S/o Hanuman, Parveen S/o Hansraj, Sachin S/o Lilu Ram, Sandeep S/o Surender, Sushil S/o Aatma Ram, Pardeep S/o Kapil Dev and Sandeep @ Kaif S/o Prem Singh (petitioner) opened attack upon him. They caught hold of him and started hitting him with one sharp object. On raising alarm his friends Jai Bhagwan, Sahil, Parveen, Parmod etc. rescued him. He was admitted in the hospital for treatment and was referred to

MAMC Agroha. The request was made to take legal action against the culprits.

**CRM-M-61075-2024****-2-**

As a cross case to the incident, another FIR i.e. FIR No.504 dated 22.08.2023 was registered by petitioner-Sandeep @ Kaif. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 21.04.2024. He approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar declined the bail application vide order dated 30.05.2024. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Satnam. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 13.10.2025, passed in CRM-M-27435-2025, whereby, co-accused Satnam has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 21.04.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Satnam. On instructions, he has submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 21.04.2024. Co-accused, namely, Satnam is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner has completed incarceration



CRM-M-61075-2024

-3-

witnesses, only 01 has been examined till date.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. 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.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

12.11.2025
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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