



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

212

CRM-M-30015-2026 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 29.05.2026.

Sheikh Halim @ SK Halim

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amish Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner – Sheikh Halim @ SK Halim, aged 33 years, has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS for seeking regular bail in case FIR No.89 dated 11.04.2026 under Sections 110, 115(2), 126(2), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sector-27, Sonipat.

2. Complainant– Bunty, got registered the FIR to the effect that at about 11:00 AM on 10.04.2026, when he was in the street near his house, one Somin @ Gaithi and his brother-in-law – Lijwan were standing in the street and were abusing outside our house in a loud voice. On raising objection by complainant and on cooling down by family members, they were sent back.

Again around 12:30 in the night, accused – Gaithi called Junaid and 3-4 other boys from the village, and when complainant and his uncle's son Bittu were parking the tempo on one side, accused – Gaithi, Lijwan and Junaid along with 2-3 other boys, came there in the street and blocked the

way of complainant and then started beating them with iron rods and bars, with which they were harmed. Injuries were caused to the complainant on head and other parts of the body.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that none of the injury is serious or even dangerous to life. No specific allegation has been attributed against any of the accused, including the present petitioner.

Petitioner, who is inside jail since 18.04.2026 (for about 01 month and 10 days), and offences being triable by the court of learned Magistrate, prays to be released on bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 27.05.2026. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper book.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Pardeep Kumar, submits that one of the injury suffered by injured-Bunty on his head, is punishable under Section 110 of BNS and as per allegations, petitioner was present on the spot as all the accused had reached in a Thar vehicle belonging to the petitioner. Thus, submits that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

5. During investigation, the said injury is found to be attributed to co-accused Somin @ Gaithi. Since no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner except of one attributed to co-accused Somin @ Gaithi, all other injuries are stated to be triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. Looking at the nature of injury sustained by injured and that petitioner is inside jail for the last 01 month and 10 days and conclusion of trial will consume

considerable time, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail to the petitioner as further incarceration of the petitioner inside the jail without proving of charges would be improper.

Considering the above said circumstances in totality, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

9. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.** Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.05.2026
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No