

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

CRM-M-5856-2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Vikas @ Nikka @ Vikash

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Ajay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

Vinod S. Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.151 dated 28.04.2024, registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 341, 506 and 120-B IPC (Sections 302, 307, 325 and 411 IPC added later on), at Police Station Agroha, District Hisar. The earlier bail application was disposed of as not pressed vide order dated 28.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-16901-2025.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as a matter of fact, incorrect detail with regard to criminal antecedents of the petitioner was given at the time his earlier bail application was considered. In fact, the petitioner stands acquitted in two cases and one case apart from the present one is pending against him.

2.1 Learned counsel further contends that role of the petitioner is at

par with co-accused Sushil @ Gujjar and Jatinder @ Jitansh @ Tapla to whom bail has been granted by this Court, vide orders dated 28.10.2025 and 21.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-6846-2025 and CRM-M-71288-2025, respectively, after noticing the custody period of 01 year and 07 months. It is further submitted that petitioner is in custody since 03.05.2024 and out of total 37 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined, thus, the conclusion of trial will take a sufficiently long time and further detention of the petitioner is unwarranted.

3. Learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with said Sushil @ Gujjar and Jatinder @ Jitansh @ Tapla to whom the concession of bail has already been granted by this Court. The period of custody undergone by the petitioner has also not been disputed.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case, but taking into consideration the period of custody undergone by the petitioner i.e. 01 year, 11 months and 25 days and the principle of parity that role of petitioner is at par with Sushil @ Gujjar and Jatinder @ Jitansh @ Tapla (*supra*) and also noticing that the conclusion of trial will take a long time, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.



CRM-M-5856-2026

-3-

6. Anything observed here-in-above shall not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case pending before the trial Court.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.04.2026

SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No