

2026:PHHC:088854



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M No.30499 of 2026
Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

Deepanshu ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Bishnoi, Advocate,
for Mr. S.K. Bishnoi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
08	11.01.2026	Sahlawas, District Jhajjar, Haryana	109(1), 115, 126, 190, 191(3), 324(4) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (61(2) of BNS added later on) and 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (For short “Act, 1959”) (25 (1-B) (a) of Act, 1959 added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this

2026:PHHC:088854



petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Harsh Kumar alleging therein that on 10.01.2026, he along with his friends had gone to Village Redhuwas to bring his maternal grandmother back from the house of his maternal aunt. They had reached there in two vehicles. When he reached near the house of his maternal aunt, he found the petitioner who was accompanied with the co-accused to be present there. All of them intercepted the complainant and his friends by standing in front of their vehicles. The complainant and his friends alighted from the same. Accused Manish made an exhortation thereby calling accused Lala to kill the complainant by saying that he was cousin of Kapil. The complainant then heard sounds of some fire being shot from the roof of house of Man Singh. He at once sat down and a bullet passed over his head thereby having a narrow escape for him. He tried to flee to save himself but the assailants opened an assault upon him by striking blows with lathi, dandas and iron rods etc. His vehicle was damaged. A pistol was shown to him. The complainant with the help of his friends managed to escape and went to General Hospital, Jhajjar and was referred to PGIMS Rohtak wherein he was medically examined. By alleging that the assailants who were having enmity with his cousin brother had made an attempt to kill him, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 12.01.2026. The co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

2026:PHHC:088854



4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. The ingredients for commissions of offence punishable under Section 109(1) of BNS are not attracted qua him. He is in custody since long. His continued detention is not going to serve any useful purpose and is also not required. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. A compromise has been arrived at between the petitioner and the complainant and a petition for seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of the said compromise is also pending. Two of the co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana has advance notice of the petition and while placing on record the custody certificate, it is argued by her that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled as against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution thereof is further alleged to have voluntarily caused injuries to the complainant. The injuries so sustained have, however, been opined to be simple in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 12.01.2026. Investigation stands concluded. No useful purpose would be served by detaining in the petitioner in custody any more. Though not much relevance can be given to the factum of any compromise having been arrived at between the parties, however, keeping in



view the period spent by the petitioner in custody, the nature of injuries sustained by the complainant and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

01.07.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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