



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

234

**CRM-M No.24771 of 2026
Date of decision : 7.5.2026
Date of uploading : 8.5.2026**

Aman Rana @ Ashish @ Sheesha**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Harkanwar Veer Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Sanyam Jain, 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.29 dated 9.3.2026 under Sections 110, 115, 118(1), 126, 190, 191(3), 324(5), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Raipur Rani, District Panchkula.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'The gist of the copy is as follows Statement of Reshav son of Vedpal resident of Raipur Rani district Panchkula age 18 years Mob.9729600286 stated that I am a resident of the above address and I work as a farmer. About a year ago I had an argument with Chintu resident of Barwala over some issue, since then Chintu had a grudge against me. Today on



09.03.2026 I, my maternal uncle's son Badan son of Sukhbir Singh, Prince son of Pradeep resident of Mouli Mahabir Farm Raipur Rani had come to a wedding. After eating food at the wedding, all three of us left for our home to Mouli in my car no. HR03AF 8107 brand Swift Bar color black. At around 03.00 PM when we reached near Raipur Rani tehsil office on Raipur Rani Narayangarh road, suddenly a white coloured Swift car came in front of my car. It stopped and blocked my way. I was driving my car and as soon as I applied brakes to my car, another white coloured car came and stopped behind my car and 8/9 boys from both the cars came with sticks and axes in their hands and started hitting my car with sticks and axes loudly and started abusing me. After breaking the glass of my car, Ranbir alias Raniya attacked my shoulders and arms and Vikant alias Chintu resident of Barwala tried to hit me on the head with the axe held in his hand, then I immediately stopped it with my right hand and the axe hit my right hand. Ashish alias Sheesha resident of Barwala attacked my nose with the stick held in his hand. Ashish resident of Barwala, Jassi resident of Naya village and Golu Gupta resident of Barwala and Dhillla Jat resident of Naya village and 2/3 other boys whose names I do not know, I can identify them if they come in front of me. All of them attacked me with sticks and axes. They attacked my car and damaged it completely. When I shouted for help, many people gathered at the spot, seeing whom the culprits fled from the spot with their vehicles along with their weapons saying that you have escaped today, next time we will kill you. Ranbir alias Raniya is also a resident of Barwala. Due to old enmity, the above culprits conspired with each other and blocked my way with their vehicles and inflicted severe injuries on me with sticks and axes and completely damaged my car. After some time, my friends arrived at the spot, picked me up and took me to CHC Raipur Rani, from where after treatment, Dr. Sahib referred me to GH Panchkula, where I am currently undergoing treatment. I have written a statement that legal action should be taken against the above culprits.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 14.3.2026. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution



version is taken to be correct, the petitioner has given an injury upon the injured with blunt weapon. Learned counsel has further submitted that challan, upon culmination of investigation, has already been presented. 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 5.5.2026 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 14.3.2026 wherein after investigation was carried out; challan was prepared on 6.5.2026 and subsequently filed. Total 15 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date as charges are yet to be framed. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon 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 5.5.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of



01 month and 21 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 2 other FIRs. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

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

7.5.2026
Ashwanii

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