

2025:PHHC:170115



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

227

CRM-M-67560-2025
Date of decision: 05.12.2025

ASGAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 179 dated 08.06.2024, registered under Section(s) 148, 149, 323, 324, 341 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 302/326 of the IPC was added later on) at Police Station Hathin, Palwal, District Palwal.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner in relation to the death of Afjal, who passed away on 10.06.2024 at Safdarjung Hospital, Delhi. The fatal injuries have been specifically attributed to co-accused Saleem son of

Kasim and Azroo son of Akhtar. It is further submitted that the case of the petitioner stands on the same footing as that of the co-accused who were attributed injuries only to witness Barkat and who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 27.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-19074-2025 titled Akil v. State of Haryana and CRM-M-11069-2025 titled Aamir v. State of Haryana. Additionally, co-accused Aabid has also been granted regular bail vide order dated 27.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-65468-2025. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has already undergone actual custody of around 01 year and 04 months and is not involved in any other criminal case.

3. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute that the case of the present petitioner stands on the same footing as that of the co-accused who have already been extended the concession of regular bail and that the petitioner is not attributed any injury to the deceased Afjal. He also does not dispute that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

5. In view of the facts noticed above, and taking into consideration that the co-accused, who stand on an identical footing with the petitioner, have already been granted the concession of regular bail and further noting that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner on the person of deceased Afjal and that he is not involved in any other criminal case, I find no distinguishing feature to deny the petitioner similar relief. Accordingly, by extending the principle of parity, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses 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.

DECEMBER 05, 2025

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No