



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

**CRM-M No.8838 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:01.05.2026**

Ravi @ Ravi Malik

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr.Pardeep Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sunil Sihag, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.110 dated 07.02.2023, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 148, 149, 302, 341 [Section 120-B IPC added later on] of Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Sector 58, District Faridabad.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being on a complaint submitted by 'Balwant' son of 'Mohan Lal' who alleged that 'Vipin' the deceased was his nephew, and that he was a student of class-11 in Rawal International School Sector 56, Faridabad. According to complainant, after school when 'Vipin' had to return home, and that he along his sister 'Neha', took lift on the motorcycle of 'Akash', and that



on the way 7-8 persons, riding on two motorcycles and a scooty, intercepted them and launched an assault upon 'Vipin' and inflicted injuries on his person with the knife. It was also stated by the complainant that his nephew was also thrashed brutally by the above named assailants. According to complainant, he was working in the neighbouring field and when his nephew 'Vipin' screamed for help, he rushed to the spot and saw that his nephew was being thrashed by the assailants. According to complainant, his nephew had disclosed the name of assailants as 'Sachin Thakur', 'Vishal', 'Naveen', 'Abhishek' and 'Shivam' etc. and that later on his nephew passed away.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case, was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution during the course of investigation when accused 'Sachin' was arrested he suffered a disclosure statement and disclosed that one of the assailants was Ravi, i.e. the petitioner.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is innocent who has been simply roped up on the basis of disclosure statement of his co-accused. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a long incarceration for being in custody for a period of three years, two months and eighteen days. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for bail.

6. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that there is direct nexus between the commission of offence and the petitioner, and that the



present case is based on eye-witness account, wherein the statement of eye-witness can easily prove the identity of petitioner as one of the assailants. During the course of argument, it has been highlighted by the learned State counsel that the present petition is the third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstances has taken place. According to learned State counsel all the grounds taken in the present petition have already been dealt with, on merits, in the former bail petition, and therefore, the present petition warrants dismissal.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that the petitioner had approached this Court for bail on earlier occasion also and the co-ordinate Bench after considering the merits of the case dismissed the petition for bail moved by the petitioner on 30.07.2024. The second petition for bail was dismissed on 28.10.2025. From the date of dismissal of above mentioned petitions, no significant change in relevant circumstance is notable, and therefore, it is hereby held the present petition for bail is not maintainable. In view of above, it is hereby held that present petition deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

01.05.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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