



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(154+216)

CRM-13550-2026 in/and
CRA-S-137-2026(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION:22.04.2026

GopalAppellant

VERSUS

State of Haryana and anotherRespondents

CORAM HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.V.P.Sangwan, Advocate, for the appellant.
Mr.Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

CRM-13550-2026

Since the present appeal for regular bail is being decided today itself, therefore, the present application has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

CRA-S-137-2026

1. By way of present appeal, the appellant is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.277 dated 01.11.2025, under Sections 115, ,351(3), 3(5) of BNS and 3(2) (va) of SC/ST Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Dadri.
2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that Jai Bhagwan (who is a sweeper by profession), alleged that on 01.11.2025, upon reaching the house of Mahipal for cleaning work, the appellant Gopal started abusing him with caste-based remarks. When he objected, Gopal continued the abuse and, along with co-accused Ajit, assaulted him. Ajit inflicted danda blows,



**CRM-13550-2026 in/and
CRA-S-137-2026(O&M)**

2

while appellant Gopal gave kicks and fist blows to the complainant and also extended threats to kill him.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that in the present case there is only one injury, which is stated to be on the non vital part of the body and there is an observation of the doctor to the effect that the possibility of the same cannot be ruled out to be suffered due to fall; that investigation has already been completed in the present case, challan has been presented and charges have been framed; that trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the appellant behind the bar; that appellant is having clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case; that the statement of the complainant is not found true as one of the accused has been exonerated and found innocent. Hence, prayer for grant of regular bail to the appellant is made.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, appears and files custody certificate of the appellant, same is taken on record. Learned State counsel oppose the appeal by submitting that present appellant caused grievous injury to the complainant and also abused him with caste-based remarks and FIR has been registered including one of the Section of SC/ST Act against the present appellant.

5. Heard.

6. Taking into consideration the contentions of the learned counsel for the appellant as well as learned State counsel; that the present appellant is in custody since 09.12.2025; that the only one injury i.e fracture is stated to be on a non vital part i.e hand and it is also opined by doctor that the same



CRM-13550-2026 in/and 3
CRA-S-137-2026(O&M)

can be suffered due to fall; that the appellant is having clear antecedents and not involved in any other case; that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the appellant behind the bar as concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the appellant.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant appeal is **allowed**. The appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

22.04.2026 (SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta JUDGE

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