



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

210

**CRM-M No.23345 of 2026
Date of decision : 1.5.2026
Date of uploading : 1.5.2026**

Vikram Singh @ Vikram @ Bikar**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sumit Chahal, Advocate, for the petitioner
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.123 dated 18.5.2025 under Sections 190, 191(3), 115(2), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 190, 191(3) of BNS deleted and Sections 103(1), 109(1), 3(5) and 117(2) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'Statement of Pinky, wife of Baljeet Singh, son of Ramkumar, son of Moolu Ram, resident of Balbehra, Police Station Cheeka, aged 35 years, mobile number 9896427518, stated that I am a resident of the above-mentioned name and address and my husband Baljeet Singh used to drive a vehicle and is now in Transport Baba Durga Nath Cheeka. I have two sons. The



elder son Harman Singh has appeared for 10th-grade exams, after him, the younger son Ankush studies in the seventh class. My father-in-law late Shri Ram Singh's elder brothers Mange Ram and Ramkumar have passed away. Their youngest brother Shishpal is alive. My father-in-law are four brothers in total. Among them, the eldest Mange Ram had two marriages and had no children. His wife Dhanno Devi has been living with us for the last one year. A dispute regarding Dhanno Devi's share of land is ongoing with other members of our family. Mange Ram was having 3-acre numbered land/ancestral land. The dispute is specifically about the leasing out the same land. Regarding this land dispute, on 15-05-2025, I went to the house of Vikram Singh, son of Ram Singh, son of Molu Ram, to talk and suggested calling late Mange Ram's first wife Bharpo Devi from Dhamtan as well, and to settle this dispute by sitting down with the male members of the house. During this time, other men of the house including Shishpal son of Molu Ram, Ramniwas son of Shishpal, Meenu son of Shishpal, Kamla Devi wife of Shishpal, Bindra Kaur wife of Ramniwas, Ramrati wife of Ram Singh, Aman wife of Vikram, Subhash son of Ramkumar (my own brother-in-law) and his wife Seema Devi, some of whom were already there and some came after hearing the heated argument between me and Vikram, said, "isko bada Panchayati bana do". All these men and women were carrying sticks, clubs, axes/gandasi, and lathi in their hands and launched a sudden, fierce attack on me, repeatedly striking my legs, hands, back, and hips, and then they all said to settle her husband Baljeet today as well. As they were exiting the house, they struck my husband's head with an axe and everyone beat him severely, leaving both of us half-dead. Subhash hit me on the head with the back of an axe and hit my husband on the head with an axe too, and then they left while threatening to kill us, and were saying, "dobara bade Panchayati mat banna" (not to act like a big panchayati again). Our neighbor Mela Ram admitted us to Guhla Hospital where we were given first aid, and the doctor referred us to Rajendra Hospital Patiala. My husband's condition worsened the same day, so the doctor referred him from Rajendra Hospital to PGI CHD. My family members have admitted my husband Baljeet to PGI SEC-12 CHD. My husband is still in an unconscious state. The aforementioned persons have caused us illegal injuries regarding the land dispute of Bharpo Devi. Strict legal action should be taken against them. I have got written my statement to you, heard and understood it,



which is correct. I have passed 5th class. SD/- Pinki Rani.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 23.5.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the prime prosecution witness, namely Pinky Rani (PW-1), who is the FIR-complainant/wife of the deceased, has turned hostile while having been examined as a prosecution witness. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 30.4.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 23.5.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out; challan was prepared on 2.8.2025 and subsequently filed. Total 33 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which 4 have been examined and 01 has been given up till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contention; including the weightage required to be attached to the testimony of the hostile witness; shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival



contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 30.4.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 11 months and 8 days & is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed



hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

1.5.2026
Ashwanii

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