



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-30350-2026

Date of decision: 1st July, 2026

Sandeep

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Karan Jangra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 227 dated 03.11.2025 registered under Sections 115, 117, 190, 91(2) of BNS (Sections 109(1) and 61(2) of BNS was added later on) at Police Station Bhatu Kalan, District Fatehabad.

2. The facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that on 28.11.2025, the victim Jai Bhagwan had gone to the house of Sonu brother of accused Lal Singh for some work. It is alleged that accused Lal Singh called the victim to his house. When the victim reached there, he found accused Lal Singh sitting along with 4-5 other persons. All of them

2026:PHHC:088849



opened an attack upon the victim and caused injuries to him, as a result of which he became unconscious. Upon regaining consciousness, he found himself to be admitted in the hospital. The FIR was registered on the basis of the statement made by Jai Dev, brother of the victim. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During the course of investigation, accused Lal Singh was formally arrested. He suffered a disclosure statement on the basis of which the present petitioner was nominated as an accused and was arrested on 12.11.2025. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in the present case merely on the basis of the disclosure statement of a co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. It is further contended that there is a delay of five days in registration of the FIR, which has not been satisfactorily explained. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. The complainant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. The petitioner was not present at the spot at the relevant time. The petitioner has been in custody since 12.11.2025. He is not required for further investigation. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and while placing on record the custody certificate, submits that keeping in view

2026:PHHC:088849



the gravity and nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is further alleged to have voluntarily caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the brother of the complainant. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of subject offences against him. However, he has been in custody for more than seven months. Investigation stands concluded and the challan has already been presented before the trial Court. The antecedents of the petitioner are stated to be clean. The trial will obviously take considerable time to conclude. In view of the discussion made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore and he has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

2026:PHHC:088849



9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

1st July, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |