



221

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

**CRM-M No.70833 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.12.2025**

Rohit @ Mahesa Aala

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. N. P. Chandel, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

CRM-50981-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-70833-2025

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0202, dated 06.08.2024, under Sections 115, 126, 3(5), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 117(2), 109(1), 61, 190, 191(2), 191(3) and 351(3) of BNS added and Sections 3(5), 351(2) of BNS deleted during investigation), registered at Police Station Dadri City, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case has been got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ravi Parkash. It was alleged that on 06.08.2024, the complainant along with his brother, namely, Harsh had gone to the Court at Charkhi Dadri and when



they were returning, they were way laid by Mohit, Rohit @ Jagira, Rohit @ Mehsha Ala (petitioner). It was alleged that they stopped their vehicles. The complainant was taken out from the vehicle in which he was travelling. They caused injuries to the complainant with sticks, however he was rescued by his brother, namely, Harsh and friend, namely, Vikas. However, after causing injuries, they left the spot by threatening them. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The complainant was medico legally examined. The petitioner was arrested on 04.11.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Charkhi Dadri declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 02.12.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

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, Parveen @ Sonu, Rohit @ Jagira and Mohit. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 04.11.2025 and 18.11.2025, passed in **CRM-M-43257-2025**, **CRM-M-44619-2025** and **CRM-M-62582-2025**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Sonu, Rohit @ Jagira and Mohit have been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 04.11.2024. He has submitted 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 have 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, Parveen @ Sonu, Rohit @ Jagira and Mohit. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 04.11.2024. Co-accused, namely, Parveen @ Sonu, Rohit @ Jagira and Mohit are on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 01 month and 14 days as on 18.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 11 other cases, however in 10 cases, he is on bail.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail on the basis of parity.

8. 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.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of

opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

19.12.2025

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No