



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-17808-2026
Decided on : 09.04.2025

Jagvir . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. DPS Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jagvir	131	09.10.2024	103, 109, 115(2), 127(2), 191(2), 190, 140(1) of the BNS of 2023 [erstwhile Sections 302, 307, 323, 342, 147, 149, 364 of IPC]	Alewa	Jind

2. As per case of prosecution, the factual aspect is that the alleged incident occurred on 06/07.10.2024 yet the FIR was registered for the first time on 09.10.2024. The deceased – Bunty, passed away on 11.10.2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that during the period Bunty was hospitalized, in an injured condition, no statement of him was recorded. Notably, there is no evidence on record to suggest that the deceased was medically unfit to give any statement. Since neither there is any direct



evidence nor any specific allegation against the petitioner.

Besides, learned counsel submits that one of the co-accused of the petitioner, i.e., Gurmail Singh, has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated **09.03.2026**, passed in **CRM-M-34754-2025 (O&M)**, titled as, **“Gurmail Singh v. State of Haryana” (P-5)**. He submits that case of the petitioner is almost on similar footings. Therefore, in view of the above and by claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that this is a serious case in which the deceased was brutally beaten. However, despite being asked repeatedly, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has failed to point out any direct evidence linking the petitioner as a responsible person who caused the injuries, resulting to death of Bunty.

Besides, other factual aspects of the case as well as the factum of granting regular bail to the co-accused – Gurmail Singh, is also not disputed by learned State counsel.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by observing that as per the complaint, total 13 persons have been made accused, however, no specific role is attributed to anyone of them. Even as per the case of the complainant, it was co-accused Manjit only, who had given information to the complainant causing injuries to the deceased.

Further, noticing the fact that the petitioner is already inside jail



for the last more than a period of about 01 year and 06 months and is not involved in any other case. There are total 25 witnesses, out of whom, only one has been examined. Besides, factum of grant of regular bail to co-accused Gurmail Singh, whose case stands on similar footing, also cannot be ignored.

5. In view of the totality of the circumstances, particularly the absence of any specific role attributed to the petitioner, the principle of parity, the period of incarceration already undergone, and the stage of trial, and also without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further detention of the petitioner inside the jail would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, 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.



8. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 09, 2026
J.Ram

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