



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M No.20394 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

Virender @ Veera

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. S.S.Momi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.233 dated 29.09.2021 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307 and 506 [Sections 323, 324, 34 added later on and Sections 147, 148 and 149 were deleted] of Indian Penal Code and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, Police Station City Dadri, District Charkhi Dardi.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Lali', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above named complainant that on 28.09.2021 at about 3.30 P.M. she along with her daughter 'Payal' was standing outside her house, where 'Sandeep', 'Shivam', 'Shubham' and 'Sanjay' arrived, and hurled abuses to both of them (i.e. complainant and her daughter). According to complainant the above



named four persons also launched an assault upon her daughter and in the above mentioned assault accused 'Sandeep' attacked 'Payal' with a steel rod. The complainant further alleged that she rescued her daughter and shifted her to Government Hospital, Charkhi Dadri.

3. It was further alleged that on the same day at about 9.00 P.M. 'Sandeep', 'Shubham', 'Shivam' and 'Veera' armed with knife came to the hospital and they all assaulted her with knife. As per complainant when she screamed for help all the assailants fled from the spot. The complainant further stated that when their neighbours namely 'Akshay', 'Ankit' and 'Harsh' came to the hospital to know about their well-beings, they, too, were waylaid by 'Sandeep', 'Shubham', 'Shivam' and 'Veera', and assaulted. According to complainant in the above mentioned incident injuries were inflicted on their person.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

5. **Notice of motion.**

6. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. She has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

7. **Heard.**

8. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that by



virtue of order dated 24.01.2025, the benefit of bail was accorded to the petitioner, but on account of unavoidable circumstances, i.e. illness of his mother, the petitioner could not appear before the Court on 12.05.2025, and therefore, by withdrawing the benefit of bail the bonds of the petitioner were forfeited to the State. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, thereafter, the petitioner was arrested on 14.07.2025 in another case and since then he is in custody. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that in view of the fact that breach of conditions of bail has been committed by the petitioner only for once, and he has already served a long period of incarceration after re-arrest, he is entitled to the benefit of bail.

9. The learned State counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in view of gravity of offence and the past conduct of the petitioner, he is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of the record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision in the present petition:-

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than one year, one month and nineteen days;
- ii) that earlier also the benefit of bail was accorded to the petitioner, by virtue of order dated 24.01.2025;
- iii) that the petitioner has breached the condition of bail only for once;
- iv) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to



serve any purpose;

- v) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in trial.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession of fresh bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

13. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. However, the abovesaid benefit shall be subject to following conditions:-

- i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any other authority;
- ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission



of trial Court.

14. It is, however, made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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