



CRM-M-12648-2025 and
CRM-M-67734-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-12648-2025

Ran Singh @ Ajay

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
220-2

...Respondent

CRM-M-67734-2025

Mukesh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Decided on: 19.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-12648-2025).

Mr. Amit, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-6774-2025).

Mr. Amish Sharma, Asst. A.G., Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.(Oral)

1. By way of this common order, present petitions are being disposed of together, as they arise out of one common FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 0368 dated 11.09.2024, under Section 109(2), 115, 3(5), 351(2) of BNS (Section 117(2) of BNS was added later on), registered at Police Station Agroha, District Hissar

3. As per the allegations in the FIR, Ajay Bamal (petitioner in CRM-M-12648-2025), along with Sonu and another person initially



CRM-M-12648-2025 and CRM-M-67734-2025 2
unknown and later identified as Mukesh (petitioner in CRM-M-67734-2025), allegedly assaulted the injured Sanjay with iron rods/sticks.

As per the roles attributed to the accused, the incident occurred in the following manner:

Name of accused	Weapon Used	Injury caused	Victim
Petitioner-Ajay Bamal	Iron rod	Blow on left leg Blow on left knee	Salim complainant-Sanjay
Petitioner-Mukesh	Iron rod	Blow on hand	Salim
Sonu	Iron rod Iron rod	Low on leg blow on head	Salim complainant-Sanjay

4. Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang, Advocate, and Mr. Amit, Advocate, submit that as per the Medico-Legal Reports, injured Salim and complainant Sanjay suffered multiple injuries; however, neither any specific injury nor the cumulative injuries were declared to be dangerous to life, though some injuries were opined to be grievous in nature.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further argue that both petitioners have clean antecedents, except for one case registered against petitioner Mukesh under the Arms Act, in which he is already on bail. On the other hand, injured Salim Khan is stated to be facing eight criminal cases. Learned counsel submit that petitioner Ran Singh @ Ajay has been in custody since 27.10.2024, i.e., for a period of about one year, two months, and nineteen days, and petitioner Mukesh has been in custody since 26.01.2025, i.e., for about eleven months and twenty-one days. On these grounds, prayer is made for the grant of regular bail.

5. I have considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties.



**CRM-M-12648-2025 and
CRM-M-67734-2025**

3

6. Upon being queried by the Court, learned State counsel was unable to point out how the offence under Section 307 IPC has been invoked, except on the ground of the multiple fractures suffered by injured Salim. The complainant Sanjay has also suffered multiple injuries.

7. Taking into consideration that the injured witnesses were required to be examined at the first instance, proceedings were deferred on 25.08.2025 to enable the prosecution to examine them. However, despite the lapse of more than four months thereafter, even the charges have not yet been framed. Moreover, after framing of charges, the prosecution proposes to examine as many as fifteen witnesses, whose examination is yet to commence.

In the absence of any specific medical opinion attributing the injuries to an offence under Section 307 IPC, i.e., attempt to commit murder, a pertinent issue arises for consideration by the trial Court as to whether the offence under Section 307 IPC is, in fact, made out. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court finds merit in the prayer of the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions is **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



**CRM-M-12648-2025 and
CRM-M-67734-2025**

4

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. Petitions stand disposed of.

10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

January 19, 2026
Rashmi

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