

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CRM-M-24138-2025
Decided on : 27.02.2026

Vikash Yadav

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. R.S. Rai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhsharan Sra, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG Haryana

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
Mr. Pradeep Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate for the complainant

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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vikash Yadav, aged 37 years	0544	05.12.2024	109(1), 126, 191(2), 191(3), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 109(2) of BNS was deleted and Section 109(1) was added)	City Narnaul	Mahendergarh

2. Incident took place in the Court compound of Narnaul (Haryana).

FIR in the case got registered by ASI Ramphal, who at the time of incident on



05.12.2024 was present in the Court premises. At first instance, he acquired knowledge of happening of an incident regarding the attack over victim-Amit @ Sonu. Thereupon, on examining the video from the CCTV cameras installed in Court and by talking to the people it was found that victim Aman @ Sonu was attacked by the members of the opposite party of Jitendra @ Hitler, in connivance with his other companions namely (i) Aman (ii) Surider Pehelwan, (iii) Ghanshyam alias Gharsi (iv) Manmohan Sharma and (v) Rahul alias Junior, (vi) Rohit. After completion of investigation, the challan at initial stage was submitted qua four of the accused and subsequently supplementary final report was submitted qua two of the accused and second supplementary statement qua five of the accused and, thus, total 11 accused are finally facing trial. The incident is recorded in the CCTV footage installed in the Court premises. The sole victim/injured Amit @ Sonu has already been examined in the witness box.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner was involved in number of criminal cases and as a matter of fact presently also he is inside jail in some other criminal case. Out of 38 total prosecution witnesses, about 20 have been examined and 18 more are yet to be examined in the witness box. Thus submits that total incarceration period of about 01 year 02 months and 20 days already stands suffered by petitioner inside jail and even he was not present at the time of incident on spot. Thus, his involvement in the case is based only upon the doubt that he was one of the conspirator for planning to commit murder of Amit @ Sonu. Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. Learned State counsel with able assistance of counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned

counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner is a known criminal and he is already involved in six other criminal cases. The same are being referred from para 8 of impugned order and for convenience same are referred here under:

Sr. No.	FIR No. & Date	U/s	P.S.
1.	FIR No.283 date 03.10.2022	148, 149, 323, 506 IPC	Ateli
2.	FIR No.100 date 28.05.2022	323, 324, 452, 506, 34 IPC	Ateli
3.	FIR No.257 date 28.09.2019	148, 149, 307, 323, 341, 506 IPC & 25- 54-59 Arms Act	Ateli
4.	FIR No.155 date 12.05.2022	25-54-59 Arms Act	Ateli
5.	FIR No.544 date 05.12.2025	109(1), 126, 191(2), 191(3), 61 BNS & 25-54- 59 Arms Act	City Narnaul
6.	FIR No.43 date 24.07.2024	406, 498-A IPC	Women Police Station, Manesar

5. Thus, submits that in view of the apprehension that the petitioner, if released on bail may impress upon the witnesses and may also hamper the smooth functioning of the trial Court, where statement of 18 more witnesses are yet to be recorded. However, there is no denial that the sole injured Amit @ Sonu has already been examined in the witness box, by supporting the case of the prosecution.

6. On being asked by the Court, it is also informed by counsel for the complainant that the injured Amit @ Sonu is also involved in total 09 criminal cases.

7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

8. Admittedly, the whole incident is recorded in CCTV footage installed in the Court premises. It is also admitted position that petitioner was not seen in



CRM-M-24138-2025

the CCTV footage and was not present at the spot of the incident. Allegation is that it was he, who sent other accused in his own car is yet to be confirmed by the trial Court, after leading of the complete evidence before it. Moreover, at this stage, it can not be assumed that petitioner's vehicle was being used definitely because in FIR no registration number of any vehicle is mentioned.

9. Taking into consideration that the statement of material witness Amit @ Sonu has already been recorded and the petitioner is inside jail for 01 year, 02 months and 20 days and the nature of wherein the petitioner is involved (referred here above), this Court finds no justifiable ground to deny the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Before parting with the order it is noticed that as per report sent by the trial Court out of total 29 prosecution witnesses, 20 stands already examined and six had been given up and only 03 more yet to be examined. However, said fact was asked to be confirmed from the State counsel and also from the petitioner's counsel, who after confirmation of stage of trial informed that out of total 38 prosecution witnesses, only 20 have been examined and other are yet to be examined.

10. 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.

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

12. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to

decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

13. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

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

February 27, 2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No