

2026:PHHC:073047



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

220

**CRM-M-25304-2026
Date of decision: 11.05.2026**

GURWINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Dhruv Sihag, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Dinesh Mourya, Advocate
for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.360 dated 06.09.2025, registered at Police Station Chandimandir, Panchkula, under Sections 109(1), 115, 117(2), 118(1), 118(2), 190, 191(3), 351(2) and 61 of BNS, (corresponding Sections 307, 323, 324, 325, 326, 148, 149, 506 and 120-B IPC)
2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 2 months and 8 days. He alleges false implication. There is no medical opinion with regard to the injuries declaring the same to be dangerous to life. Further, the matter has since been compromised with the complainant. Co-accused, namely, Gurpeet Singh, Navneet Kumar, Vijay, Gourav and Virender Singh have already been granted bail by this Court, after being in custody for

almost the same period. Supplementary challan qua the petitioner has been prepared and the same is yet to be presented before the Illaqa Magistrate and there are, in all, 21 PWs. He is involved in 02 more case wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having inflicted injuries to Ali Ahmed and Natha Khan. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case; the petitioner being on bail in other cases and the co-accused having been enlarged on bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant affirms the factum of compromise and has no objection for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi (Supra)** had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the Jurisdiction of the Court, etc."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 08 days; on bail in other cases; co-accused are on bail; supplementary challan stands prepared, as such charges are yet to be framed and there are total 21 PWs; the trial is likely to take a considerable time and further incarceration of the petitioners would be

violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the conditions imposed by the Court concerned, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Rajender

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