



232

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

CRM-M-23243-2026

Date of decision : 21.05.2026

Vikas

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.997 dated 30.12.2025, under Sections 351(1) and 118(2), registered at Police Station City Karnal, Haryana.

2. As per the facts of the case, the present FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Suraj @ Rajat. It was alleged that on 28.12.2025 at around 6:00 P:M, he was coming to his house on his motorcycle from the house of his Aunt and when he reached outside his house then his cousin Vikas gave him slaps and fist blows and also abused him. It was alleged that when the complainant asked him the reason for fight then Vikas cut the complainant's left ear with his teeth and severed it from his body and when the complainant raised alarm, then people rescued him from Vikas. On seeing the crowd, Vikas fled away from the spot after threatening him. The complainant was admitted in Government Hospital, Karnal by his neighbours for treatment. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprit. On registration of FIR,



investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 29.01.2026. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 15.04.2026. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Suraj @ Rajat. He submits that both the petitioner and the complainant are first cousins. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He submits that even otherwise the matter has been amicably resolved with the family members of both the sides. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars from last about 04 months. He submits that investigation is complete and charges are framed and thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has endorsed the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and has affirmed the factum of compromise.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits the petitioner had bitten the left ear of the complainant and his left ear is totally severed from his head. He submits that the same is medically corroborated and the petitioner does not deserves the concession of bail. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.



6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner and the complainant are the first cousins. The alleged injury on the left ear of the complainant is given by the bite given by the petitioner. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 03 months and 21 days as on 19.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Admittedly, the family members of both the sides have amicably resolved their *inter se* dispute.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, 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. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.05.2026
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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