



CRM-M-22850-2026

-1-

259

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

CRM-M-22850-2026

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Aabid @ Abid

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Anas Ahmad, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Afjal Hussain, Advocate
for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.203 dated 30.12.2024, under Sections 109(1), 191(3), 190, 333, 351(3), 115(2), 117(2) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25-54-59 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Bichhore, District Nuh.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Yunus. As evident from the allegations made in the FIR, the complainant and accused side were already inimical to each other and there are ongoing litigation cases between them. On 28.12.2024 at about 05:00-05:30 p.m., the present occurrence took place, wherein the accused persons mentioned in the FIR came armed with sticks, rods and firearms to the shop of Ikram, where



Ikram, Irshad, Salman and others were already present and they were attacked by the accused persons. Jalauddin fired from gun, which hit the right hand of Irshad and thereafter, Sappan also fired from his pistol. Then Khussi son of Nijra fired a bullet shot. In this occurrence Sarukh gave stick blows to the complainant and Abid (present petitioner) hit Ikram on the back with a stick. On raising alarm, all the accused escaped from the place of occurrence alongwith their respective weapons. Thus, request was made to take legal action against all the accused persons. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The injured were medico legally examined. The petitioner was arrested on 08.11.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Nuh praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 23.03.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 16.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-71720-2025; 08.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-67219-2025; and 14.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-34669-2025 by this Court, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Hasin @ Haseen, Sharop @ Sarup @ Sarukh and Arshad @ Arsad Khan @ Sadda have been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, who have



been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR, who was armed with stick and gave blow of the same to the injured.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Hasin @ Haseen, Sharop @ Sarup @ Sarukh and Arshad @ Arsad Khan @ Sadda Arshad @ Arsad Khan @ Sadda, who have already been granted bail by this Court. She has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was alleged to have given stick blow upon the injured. He was arrested on 08.11.2025. Firearm injuries have been attributed to the co-accused of the petitioner. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Hasin @ Haseen, Sharop @ Sarup @ Sarukh and Arshad @ Arsad Khan @ Sadda Arshad @ Arsad Khan @ Sadda, have already been granted bail vide orders dated 16.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-71720-2025; 08.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-67219-2025; and 14.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-34669-2025 by this Court. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 05 months & 24 days as on 30.04.2026. It further shows that though there are 13 other cases pending



against the petitioner, however, in 04 cases, he is on bail.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

30.04.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No