



CRM-M-17220-2026

-1-

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

209

CRM-M-17220-2026
Date of decision : 17.04.2026

RAJAT ALIAS KALI

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No.0279 dated 28.05.2025 under Sections 351(2), 191(3), 190, 115 BNS (erstwhile Sections 506, 148, 149, 323 IPC) and Sections 115(2), 308(2), 304, 238(C) BNS (erstwhile Sections 323, 384, 201 IPC) added later on, registered at Police Station Krishana Gate, Thanesar Kurukshetra, District Kurukshetra.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant-Rahul used to run a cycle stand at the parking area situated on Railway Road, Kurukshetra. On the night of 26.05.2025, the complainant was present at the said cycle stand along with his helper, Gulshan Sharma. At about 11:15 PM, six persons, including co-accused Cheenu and Gagandeep Thapa, along with three other unknown persons, arrived at the spot in a drunkard condition and started

**CRM-M-17220-2026****-2-**

abusing the complainant. It is alleged that co-accused Cheenu threatened the complainant and demanded payment of a monthly allowance. Upon refusal by the complainant, all the assailants allegedly started beating him with sticks, broom and a chair lying at the spot. One of the accused persons is further alleged to have hit the complainant on his forehead with an empty beer bottle. Thereafter, all the accused persons fled away from the spot. It is also alleged that during the occurrence, the accused persons snatched an amount of Rs.1,500/- from the pocket of the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case while there is no incriminating material on record to connect him with the alleged offence. Moreover, the disclosure statement allegedly suffered by the petitioner while in police custody cannot be treated as admissible. It is submitted that the petitioner has not been attributed any specific injury to the complainant and he was merely present at the spot and he is alleged to have extorted money from the complainant. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months and 09 days. Although the petitioner has been convicted in two other cases but he is on bail in those cases. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as none out of 16 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed reply by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, HQ, Kurukshetra and the custody certificate in Court, which are taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the

**CRM-M-17220-2026****-3-**

petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months and 09 days. He, upon instructions, submits that none out of 16 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months and 09 days and that the trial is likely to take a long time because none out of 16 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

7. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, in case he is not required in any other case.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 17, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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