



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-14478-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.02.2026

Gaurav

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

Mr. N.S. Sodhi, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.07 dated 15.01.2025, registered under Section(s) 109, 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the incident in question is stated to have occurred on 14.01.2025 whereupon the present FIR was registered on 15.01.2025. It is contended that immediately, after the incident, the petitioner was admitted to hospital and the medical history furnished at that stage was to the effect that it was a case of a road side accident. He further contends that offence under Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was added at a later stage with the oblique motive of pressurizing the petitioner, since his uncle namely Surajpal Bhoora had earlier lodged FIR No 0013 dated 19.01.2024 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station

Chansa, District Faridabad against the victim herein thereby indicating previous enmity between the parties. It is submitted that the victim had uploaded videos of him engaging in weightlifting, after a lapse of nearly 02 months of the incident which demonstrates that he is in perfect state of health which casts serious doubts on the story of the prosecution. It is submitted that after hearing the counsel for the respective parties at length, interim bail was granted to the petitioner vide order dated 03.05.2025 passed by this Court. The said interim bail order has continued to operate in favour of the petitioner and there is no allegation whatsoever of misuse of the concession of bail at any point in time thereafter.

3. Learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant contend that the evidence collected by the Police during the course of investigation reflects a malicious intent on the part of the petitioner. They, however do not dispute that the same is an arguable issue, which is required to be adjudicated during the course of trial. It is also not disputed that the concession of interim bail earlier granted to the petitioner has not been misused by him.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the age of the petitioner i.e. 22 years and noticing that the concession of interim bail extended to him vide order dated 03.05.2025 passed by this Court has not been misused by him, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition and confirm the order of dated 03.05.2025 granting interim bail to the petitioner.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

02.02.2026

Mangal Singh

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