



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

CRM-M-7915-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.03.2026
Date of Uploading: 16.03.2026

Narveer

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. S.N. Pillania, Advocate and
Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J.(Oral)

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.0271 dated 18.09.2025 under Section 109(1) of the BNS, 2023 [Section 351(3) of the BNS, 2023 added later-on by the trial Court vide order dated 05.01.2026], registered at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that In nutshell, the allegations of the prosecution are that on 16.09.2025 at about 11:50 PM, petitioner (herein) had suddenly given *Kassi* (spade) blow at left side of the neck of complainant Balraj (an agriculturist), while he

was present in his fields. When the complainant tried to save himself, the petitioner gave an injury with the help of spade at left side of his face due to which the complainant fell down while the petitioner left the spot. The petitioner also chased the complainant, while he was going back to his house on his motorcycle and extended threat to kill him. After reaching the house, complainant fell unconscious. His family member arranged a vehicle and took him to the hospital at Uchana but due his serious condition, the doctors referred him to General Hospital, Jind. However, his family members took him to the PGIMS, Rohtak, where he remained under treatment. As per the allegations, the petitioner gave beatings upon his family members previous also and for taking revenge, he had caused injuries on his neck with an intention to kill him.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 24.09.2025. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned Senior counsel has further submitted that the dispute actually took place into the fields of the petitioner and it is the injured, who was the aggressor. Learned Senior counsel has further submitted that there was no pre-meditated attempt on the part of petitioner to have caused injury to the injured. Learned Senior counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the dispute took place over watering of fields. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that no blood stain was found on the *Kassi*. 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 has further submitted that the assault had actually taken place in the fields of the injured and it is the petitioner (herein), who had gone to the fields of the injured to attack him. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 15.03.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

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

6. The petitioner was arrested on 24.09.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out; Challan was presented on 18.11.2025. It is not disputed that total 16 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which none has been examined till date. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues 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.

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 15.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 05 months and 21 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate the petitioner is stated to be involved in another case/FIR. 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.

11. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

March 16, 2026

Yag Dutt

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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