



220

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

**CRM-M No.24535 of 2025
Date of Decision: 19.01.2026**

Raj Kumar**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.896, dated 01.12.2024, under Sections 115, 126, 3(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 109 & 117(2), 115(2) and 126(2) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Sector 58, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Bimlesh. The occurrence in the present case has taken place on 26.11.2024. The complainant, namely, Bimlesh had alleged that the accused-petitioner, namely, Raj Kumar had given beating to her husband, brother-in-law, namely, Kailash and to her as well. They were given beatings by stones



and iron rods. They were medico legally examined and total 07 injuries to 03 accused. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 16.12.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 22.04.2025. Hence 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 has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that both the petitioner and the complainant side are neighbors. He has submitted that the dispute had taken place between both the sides and the sister of petitioner was beaten by the complainant side. He has submitted that the petitioner had already filed a complaint regarding the same. He has submitted that it is thereafter, the petitioner has been roped in the present case. He has submitted that co-accused of the petitioner, have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court. He has submitted that even otherwise, the material witnesses, i.e. the injured witnesses have been examined and there is no probability that the petitioner has been influencing the prosecution witnesses. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars since 16.12.2024. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. Status report dated 23.07.2025 by way of an affidavit of Vivek Kundu, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mujesar, District Faridabad on behalf of the respondent-State has already been filed by the learned State counsel in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is the main accused. He has submitted that the motive with the petitioner only. He has submitted that case of the co-accused, who have been granted bail by the learned trial Court, is distinguishable. He, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses including the injured witnesses have been examined.

6. Heard.

7. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the present case is of version and cross version. The petitioner is behind bars since 16.12.2024. As submitted before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner, the injured witnesses have been examined. As submitted before this Court by learned counsel for the State, on instructions, that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Admittedly, it is a case of version and cross version, it would lie within the domain of the trial Court that which party was the aggressor.

8. The veracity of the allegations and counter 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.



9. 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.

10. 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.

19.01.2026

rittu

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE