

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

2026:PHHC:078031



CRM-M-26344-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

RAVI

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.241 dated 21.05.2025 U/s 115(2), 190, 191(3), 126(2), 109(1), 351(2), 324(4), 118(2) of BNS (Earlier Sections 323, 149, 148, 341, 307, 506, 427, 326 of IPC) registered at PS Civil Lines Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that complainant, Shubham along with Deepak Paswan made a statement before the police that on 20.05.2025 at about 11:00 PM, he, along with Amar and Rohit, was returning home from the station side in a small car. While passing on the way, they noticed 15-20 boys consuming alcohol and abusing them. The boys stopped their car, upon which Amar asked them not to abuse. Thereafter, Shubham told Amar that the boys were under the influence of alcohol, and Amar drove the car away from the spot. When their vehicle reached Mughal Canal Char Chaman Chowk, in the meantime, several boys started following them on motorcycles. They had swords, sticks, axes and bricks in their hands, one of

the boys came with a stick in his hand to attack them, after that they hit the car with bricks. The assailants attacked the complainant and his associates along with their car.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Moreover, co-accused Biru, Dinesh Kumar s/o Tejpal, Dinesh Kumar s/o Jagdish Sahni and Sonu have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court vide orders dated 20.09.2025, 03.04.2026, 09.04.2026 and 23.04.2026 respectively. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 14 days. He, thus, prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Dr. Malvika Singh, D.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. She further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 14 days and he is involved in one more case under Sections 279 IPC and 304-A IPC.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that all the four co-accused have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court; though the petitioner is involved in one more case under Sections 279 IPC and 304-A IPC but he is stated to be on bail in that case; the petitioner is in custody for

the last 11 months and 14 days; the conclusion of trial is likely to take time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, *‘bail is rule and jail is exception’*.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

14.05.2026
Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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