



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-59841-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.12.2025

Rahul

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Surender Saini, Advocate and  
Mr. Nikhil Saini, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.94 dated 15.05.2025, registered under Section(s) 109(1), 115(2), 117(2), 118(2), 126(2), 351(3), 3(5) [Sections 190, 191(3) were deleted and Section 3(5) invoked in Challan] of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Sanoli, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in question has been registered on the statement of victim Sunil, son of Balbir, pursuant to a ruqa received to the effect that he had been admitted in a hospital due to an assault carried out on him. The Police team reached the Government Hospital; however, it was informed that the victim had been



referred to PGI, Rohtak. The Investigating Officer reached PGI, Rohtak on 14.05.2025 for recording the statement of the victim, but an opinion was given that he was not fit to make a statement. Eventually, the victim's brother, Rajesh, son of Randhir, submitted a written complaint on 15.05.2025 at the Police Station, stating that he is employed in Paliwal Factory, Abhitex, Panipat and that his cousin Sunil also worked in the same factory. On 14.05.2025, at about 5:30 AM, they were on their way to duty on a motorcycle driven by Rajesh. When they reached near Sanoli Road, the accused, namely, Inder, Rakesh, Ranjit, Amit, Rinku, Sunder, Mandeep, Aman, and Rahul (petitioner herein), came on a tractor and stopped them. The accused were armed with *dandas* and iron rods, and accused Rakesh was carrying a *gandasi*. Rakesh gave a *gandasi* blow on the head of Rajesh, who narrowly escaped due to wearing a helmet. Rakesh then gave a *gandasi* blow towards the head of victim Sunil, who raised his left hand to save himself. The blow landed on his left hand, causing a grievous injury with a deep cut nearly severing the hand. Thereafter, accused Inder ran the tractor over both legs of Sunil, crushing both his feet. On hearing their cries for help, family members and other persons reached the spot, upon which the accused fled with their weapons. Witness Mangal Singh brought Sunil to the Government Hospital, Panipat, from where he was referred to PGI, Rohtak. However, as the victim was bleeding profusely, he was first taken to Aadhar Hospital, Panipat, and thereafter, due to the seriousness of the injuries, he was shifted to PGI, Rohtak.



211

*CRM-M-59841-2025 (O&M)*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 17.05.2025 and has undergone an actual custody of 06 months. He contends that injuries attracting Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 are not attributed to the petitioner, rather, same are attributed to co-accused/Rakesh and Inder. He contends that injury attributed to the petitioner is a lathi blow on the hand of Sunil, which is on a non-vital part of the body.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. He however contends that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused have collectively inflicted injuries with an intention to commit murder, hence, they have been rightly arrested. However, it is not disputed that only charges have been framed in the present case and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of actual custody as well as the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or



indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

09.12.2025

Mangal Singh

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