



CRM-M-11454-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

114+244

**CRM-M-11454-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 25.03.2026**

PARTH PARASHAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Manoj Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

CRM-9700-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-9701-2026

Allowed as prayed for and Annexures P-5 & P-6 are taken on
record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-9702-2026

The present application has been filed seeking preponement
of the main case which is fixed for hearing on 09.03.2026.

Since the date of hearing of main case has already lapsed
and the main case stands listed today, the present application is rendered
infructuous, and present application is accordingly dismissed.

**Main case**

1. This is the second petition which has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.173 dated 08.08.2025 under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 190, 191(3), 324(5), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and under Section 25 of Arms Act & Section 16, 177 of Motor Vehicle Act (Added later on) registered at Police Station Sector-17, District Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant, Pankaj Singh, had submitted an application to the Electricity Department regarding alleged theft of electricity by Tota Ram, who is complainants' grandfather-in-law. Due to this enmity, co-accused Sunny, who is a relative of his wife, and Gaurav, his brother-in-law, allegedly threatened him over a telephonic call and asked him to come to Kheri Pull. When the complainant, along with Karan, Kuldeep, Mayank and Tulsi, reached Kheri Pull in his vehicle, he saw that co-accused Sunny was already present there along with two-three other vehicles. Apprehending danger, the complainant immediately turned his vehicle towards Ballabgarh via the bypass road, upon which the accused persons started chasing him in their vehicles. When the complainant reached near the Delhi-Mumbai Expressway, Sunny allegedly overtook his vehicle and fired at him with an intention to kill. The complainant tried to escape but could not succeed as his vehicle got damaged. It is further alleged that Sunny again



CRM-M-11454-2025 (O&M) -3-

attempted to fire, but no bullet was discharged from the weapon. At that time, Parth Parashar (the present petitioner), Gaurav, Rahul and two other boys were present in Sunny's vehicle. Thereafter, the complainant along with his companions managed to run away from the spot and informed the police officials about the incident.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that earlier vide order dated 29.11.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-60268-2025, the petition seeking regular bail to the petitioner was dismissed at that time, on the grounds that the investigation was going on and some of the accused were yet to be arrested. However, now fresh cause of action has arisen in favour of the petitioner for filing of the present petition, as now the investigation has been completed and all the accused in this case have been arrested; the petitioner is in custody since 05.09.2025. He contended that allegations against the petitioner are general in nature; neither any role nor any injury has been attributed to the petitioner. It is also contended that the main accused namely Sunny Chauhan and co-accused namely Prashant have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 23.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-67935 of 2025 and CRM-M-4598-2026 (Annexure P-5), respectively by this Court. As such, due to changed circumstances, the petitioner has filed the instant petition for grant of regular bail to him.

4. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate dated 23.03.2026 opposes the concession of regular bail to the petitioner and submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the



CRM-M-11454-2025 (O&M) -4-

commission of offence in the present case; the petitioner is involved in one more case bearing FIR No.118 dated 15.03.2018 under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 325 341, 506, 427 IPC at P.S. Old Faridabad, however, he fairly admits that the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail therein vide order dated 28.05.2018 passed in CRM-M-15107-2018. He further admits that the investigation is complete and challan has been presented in the present case before the trial Court and the petitioner is in custody since 05.09.2025.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the investigation is complete & challan stands presented; the main accused namely, Sunny & co-accused namely Prashant have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 23.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-67935 of 2025 and CRM-M-4598-2026 (Annexure P-5), respectively; allegations qua petitioner are general in nature; no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner; the petitioner is involved in one more case wherein he has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail; the petitioner is in custody since 05.09.2025 and the trial will take sufficient time, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of



CRM-M-11454-2025 (O&M) -5-

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 petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner 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 and by imposing such conditions so as to secure the presence of the petitioner during the trial proceedings.

9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

25.03.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO