



CRM-M-65350-2024

-1-

113+206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1) CRM-M-65350-2024
Date of decision: 19.12.2025

VIKRAM ALIAS VICKY ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ...RESPONDENT

2) CRM-M-30826-2025

SANDEEP ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Hemant Bassi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate and
Mr. Rohan Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-65350-2024.

Mr. Sukhdev Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sarun Hans, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-30826-2025.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. In the above mentioned petitions common question of law and facts are involved, so both the petitions are being disposed of by a common judgment. For brevity, facts are being taken from CRM-M-65350-2024 titled as “*Vikram @ Vicky Versus State of Haryana.*”

2. Petitioner(s) have approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.320 dated 28.06.2019 under Sections 148, 149 and 302 IPC, registered at Police Station Barwala,

**CRM-M-65350-2024****-2-**

3. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Manjeet-complainant wherein it was alleged that on 27.06.2019 at about 07:00 PM, his younger brother Naveen and his friend Vikram received a phone call to come to the Dairy. After about half an hour, he got information that Bharat along with his friends was beating Naveen and Vikram. On receiving the information, he reached at the Dairy of Bharat where he found that Bharat, Satender, Pardeep, Vicky (petitioner in CRM-M-65350-2024) along with 08/10 other unknown persons were present and all were armed with lathis and dandas. He saw that Bharat and Vicky caused injuries on the hands and legs of his brother Naveen with dandas. Satender and Pardeep also gave blows of danda. On seeing the complainant. The complainant and Mangat Ram shifted both of the injured, Naveen and Vikram to the hospital. However, both of them succumbed to injuries on the way to the hospital. Request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. After the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the petitioner-Vikram @ Vicky in (CRM-M-65350-2024) was arrested on 06.07.2019, whereas on the disclosure statement of the other co-accused, Sandeep (petitioner in CRM-M-30826-2025) was also arrayed as an accused and he was arrested on 02.11.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. They 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 applications vide orders dated 05.11.2020 and 21.05.2025, respectively. Thereafter, the petitioner, namely, Vikram @ Vicky (in CRM-M-65350-2024) approached this Court by filing three bail petitions. The all

**CRM-M-65350-2024****-3-**

three petitions bearing CRM-M-3709-2021, CRM-M-19610-2023 and CRM-M-16463-2024 were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 14.03.2022, 26.02.2024 and 22.04.2024. Aggrieved, the petitioner-Vikram @ Vicky is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the fourth petition whereas petitioner-Sandeep is before this Court for the grant of bail by way of filing the first petition.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-65350-2024 has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the allegations made in the FIR are vague in nature. He further submits the ocular version is not even medically corroborated. He further submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest i.e. 06.07.2019. He further submits that the petitioner is facing trial for more than 06 years. However, co-accused, namely, Sandeep was later arrested and on his arrest, the *de novo* trial commenced. Thus, there is no likelihood of the trial to be completed in a short period. He further submits that the complainant has been examined as PW-2 and he has not even supported the case of the prosecution and thus, has been declared hostile. He further submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-30826-2025 submits that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor any overt act has been attributed to him. However, he has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which is not even an admissible evidence. He further submits that the petitioner had been arrested after 05 years of the occurrence which itself shows that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He further submits that the petitioner is behind bars

**CRM-M-65350-2024****-4-**

since 02.11.2024. He further submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsels for the petitioner(s). He submits that Sandeep(petitioner in CRM-M-30826-2025) was one of the accused, who mercilessly gave beatings to both the deceased. However, Vikram @ Vicky (petitioner in CRM-M-65350-2024) has also inflicted beatings upon both the deceased, which resulted in their deaths. On instructions, he further submits that investigation is complete and challan has been presented. He has produced custody certificates of the petitioner(s) today in the Court and the same are taken on record. As per the custody certificate of Vikram @ Vicky, he is involved in 03 more cases, whereas Sandeep, he is involved in two more cases.

7. Heard.

8. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the name of petitioner-Sandeep surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused and he was arrested after 05 years of occurrence which indicates his false implication whereas Vikram @ Vicky has completed the incarceration of more than 06 years, as reflected in his custody certificate. However, Sandeep has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 01 month and 16 days as on 18.12.2025 and he is involved in two more cases, however, he is on bail in one case whereas Vikram @ Vicky is involved in three more cases, however, in one case in which he has been convicted, has been released on bail, and in another case he has been acquitted.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the



CRM-M-65350-2024

-5-

conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time.

10. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioner(s) succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

11 In case the bail bonds are not furnished by both the petitioner(s) during the period of 07 days from today, then their further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

19.12.2025
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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