



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.14529 of 2026 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 08.04.2026

RAJESH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

**CORAM:** *HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU*

Present :- Mr. Balvinder Sangwan, Advocate and  
Mr. Krishna Maurya, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)**

**CRM No.15336 of 2026**

This is an application for placing on record documents as  
Annexures P-6 and P-7.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is  
allowed subject to all just exceptions. Annexures P-6 and P-7 is taken on  
record.

Application stands disposed of.

**CRM-M No.14529 of 2026**

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023  
(corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of regular bail to the  
petitioner in FIR No.365 dated 19.10.2025, registered under Sections  
115(2), 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS (with Sections 117(2), 118(2), 117(3) of



BNS added later), corresponding to Sections 323, 325, 326, 506, 34 IPC, at Police Station Dabua, Faridabad.

2. On 19.10.2025, a medical ruqqa was received from B.K. Hospital, Faridabad regarding admission of injured Saad Qureshi, who had sustained injuries in a scuffle. During inquiry, it was revealed that an altercation had taken place on 18.10.2025 at about 10:30 PM in a market over the issue of firecrackers, which escalated into a scuffle wherein the injured was allegedly assaulted. On the basis of the statement of an eye-witness, the present FIR was registered. During investigation, the police added relevant sections on the basis of medical evidence, arrested the accused persons and, after completion of investigation, presented the challan before the Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and 12 days and the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he gave fist and kick blows to the injured. It is further submitted that the co-accused to whom the offence under Section 117(3) BNS has been attributed for causing complete loss of vision is a juvenile/child in conflict with law and has already been granted bail. It is also contended that the other co-accused Manjeet Singh is already in custody and the challan has been presented. Thus, keeping in view the limited role attributed to the petitioner, he deserves to be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and he was part of the unlawful assembly which caused injuries to the victim. It is contended that the offence resulted in grievous



injuries and, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

6. Keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, which is limited to causing fist and kick blows, the fact that he is in custody for the last 04 months and 12 days, and that the challan has already been presented and the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time as no prosecution witness has been examined till date, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner Rajesh is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)  
JUDGE

08.04.2026  
neetu

*Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes/No  
*Whether Reportable:* Yes/No