



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

240

**CRM-M No.64174 of 2025
Date of decision : 19.11.2025
Date of uploading : 19.11.2025**

RameshPetitioner

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

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

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana

Ms. Rosi, Advocate, for the complainant

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.47 dated 15.5.2025 under Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 324(4), 61 and 93 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 115(2), 61(2) and 91 of BNS added and Sections 115, 61 and 93 of BNS deleted during investigation), registered at Police Station Bond Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'To, SHO, Bond Kalan, Sir, it is submitted that I Renu wife of Manoj son of Ramesh and daughter of Jagdish, resident of Bond Kalan, aged 23 years, education B.A. On 12.11.2024 the marriage of mine and my



younger sister Neeraj solemnized in village Sankrod. After the marriage I and my younger sister were not in good relation with my husband and husband of my younger sister. I and my younger sister Neeraj both are living at our parental home in village Bond Kalan. I have about 5-6 months pregnancy and I was taking my vaccination and treatment from Bond Kalan. I along with my elder sister Neeraj, mother Shakuntia, father Dalip, uncle (Tau) Ram Chander went in a rented vehicle driven by Rajji of Bond Kalan to village Sankrod, our matrimonial home for bringing Aadhaar Card, Anaganwari Card, yesterday on 14.05.2025 at about 10:30 AM. When we reached there then my father-in-law Ramesh, mother-in-law Laxmi, sister-in-law Suman, brother-in-law (Nandoi) Mukesh, second sister-in-law Kusum and her husband and 2-3 other persons started gave beatings to us from Patta (leather strip), jelly and dandas. When we started to ran away then they caused damage to our vehicle. After that we got admitted in G.H. Bhiwani. The doctor at Bhiwani asked to go in General Hospital, Dadri. Then we came at G.H. Dadri. I and my sister Neeraj along with mother Shakuntla got admitted there. I received serious injuries on my body and abdomen. Due to this injury my 5-6 months pregnancy got terminated. From G.H. Dadri I was referred to MCH Dadri. My husband pressurized me to get the abortion. Due to this reason strict legal action taken against the accused. This complaint is written by my Bhabhi Babita wife of Vishal, resident of Bhiwani and I am submitting it. Sd/- Renu. Applicant Renu wife of Manoj, resident of village Sankrod.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 24.5.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question due to impending matrimonial dispute between the FIR-complainant and her husband (who is the son of the petitioner). Learned counsel has further argued that a similarly placed co-accused has been granted bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 16.10.2025 passed in CRM-M No.33736 of 2025, which order has not been laid challenge till date. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.



4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 18.11.2025 in Court, which is taken on record.

4.1 Learned counsel for the complainant has filed his *vakalatnama*, which is taken on record. She has opposed the grant of bail by arguing that there are direct and serious allegations against the petitioner. Learned counsel has further iterated that in case the petitioner is enlarged on bail, there is all likelihood of the petitioner to abscond from the process of justice and to influence the prosecution evidence. Learned counsel has further argued that the complainant had received multiple injuries and thus the offence in question has clearly been made out against the petitioner. On the strength of these submissions, she has sought dismissal of the instant petition.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 24.5.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 18.8.2025. Total 19 prosecution witnesses have been cited and it is conceded before this court that none has been examined till date. It is, thus, indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it



appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

As per custody certificate dated 18.11.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 5 months and 25 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in one more FIR registered under Sections 85, 115(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of BNS. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.



7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

19.11.2025

Ashwani