



109

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

**CRM-M-29256-2025
DECIDED ON: 07.04.2026**

UDAY PRATAP SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Pradeep Panwar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.405, dated 30.08.2023, under Sections 302, 307, 325, 452, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.
2. FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of the complainant, namely Jeet Kumar, with whom petitioner and Akash (since deceased) were working as helpers in the complainant's company.
3. As per the allegations, although petitioner had left his job ten days prior to the occurrence, however, on 29.08.2023, while the complainant was present in the company premises, petitioner entered at about 5:45 P.M. carrying an iron rod. He proceeded to the first floor, where Akash was working, and struck him on the head with the iron rod. Upon receiving the blow, Akash fell to the floor, after which petitioner inflicted further blows on his back and other parts of the body. Thereafter, petitioner fled from the spot.

3. On the very outset, learned State counsel submits that complainant-Jeet Kumar, has already been examined before the trial Court on 05.03.2025, and has fully supported the case of the prosecution.

4. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner himself had sustained certain injuries and applications in this regard were moved by his father; however, no action was taken thereon.

5. At this stage, upon a specific query by this Court as to whether there is any medical record to substantiate that petitioner had suffered injuries on 29.08.2023, learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to produce any such document.

6. It has also been noticed from the CCTV footage installed in the office that petitioner entered the premises and thereafter fled after causing injuries.

7. In view of the role attributed to the petitioner, who is the sole accused in the case, and although the allegations are yet to be adjudicated upon by the trial Court, this Court does not find any substantial ground to grant regular bail to the petitioner in the present case. **Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.**

8. However, trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously, in accordance with law.

07.04.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*