



CRM-M-8956-2026 (O&M)

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

205

CRM-M-8956-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 20.02.2026

Pronounced on: 05.03.2026

Uploaded on: 05.03.2026

MUKUL SONKAR

PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Argued by: Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.440 dated 27.11.2025 under Sections 3(5), 74, 79, 110, 126(2), 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Police Station Ambala Cantt., District Ambala, Haryana. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Complainant 'K' stated that when she was returning home on foot after attending computer course and reached vegetable market, Mukul Sonkar used foul language, blocked her way and eve teased her. She called her father to complain, whereafter, her parents and brother reached the spot and confronted him. Thereupon, Mukul Sonkar called two other boys. All three of them thrashed her brother and when her parents objected, they hit her parents with *Kada* they were wearing. Thereafter, they all hit her parents with bricks with the intent to kill them. They called at 112, were rescued and taken to Civil Hospital, Ambala Cantt.. Those boys reached civil hospital, where they threatened to kill them by shooting.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was behind bars for the last more than two months. He had also suffered injuries



CRM-M-8956-2026 (O&M)

in the course of the incident as reflected in the Medico Legal Report (Annexure P-2). It was argued that petitioner was known to the complainant which was objected to by her parents. On 26.11.2025, when petitioner and complainant were standing in the market, her parents saw them and thrashed the petitioner. Petitioner was involved in the false FIR on account of political influence. He, therefore, deserved to be released on bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that petitioner not only eve-teased and harassed the victim, he also caused injuries to her father and besides the present case, he was involved in another FIR under Section 307 IPC. Offences being grave in nature, he did not deserve the concession of bail.

5. Petitioner is a youthful offender. He is in judicial custody with effect from 27.11.2025. Mere involvement in another case cannot be a ground to refuse bail. The injuries allegedly inflicted by the petitioner to father of the complainant have been declared simple in nature. There is no reason to believe that petitioner would misuse his liberty and obstruct the course of trial in the event of release on bail. In the facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on merits, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

05.03.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

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