



CRA-S-1985-2025

-1-

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

CRA-S-1985-2025

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

Ankit

...Appellant

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Marinal Sharma, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This appeal has been filed for grant of regular bail to the appellant in case bearing FIR No.233 dated 30.06.2021, under Section(s) 148, 149, 323, 302, 452, 506, 201 IPC and Section 3(2)(v) and 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 registered at Police Station Sadar Safidon, District Jind.

2. The FIR in the present matter was registered on the basis of statement suffered by Ishwar son of Ami Lal, resident of Karkhana (hereinafter referred to as complainant) before the police on 30.06.2021. In brief, the complainant alleged in the statement that he was a labour by profession. He has three daughters and three sons. On 27.06.2021 at about 07.30 PM, he came from the fields and sat in the open yard of his house. Arun, Gulshan (sons of Chand Ram), Joni son of Subhash, Ram Dhan son of Oma, Ankit son of Bhira, Bhisma son of Raldu came there. First of all Arun, who had an iron rod in his hand, suddenly gave blow of iron rod on the head of the



complainant. Joni son of Subhash, who had a gandasi in his hand, gave gandasi blow at his legs and knees. Ankit, Bhisma and all other attacked on his stomach with an iron rod. The said persons were addicted to intoxicants. Previously also, they had attacked the complainant. The complainant had Rs.16,000/- in his pocket. All the accused went away after beating the complainant leaving him in an unconscious condition. While leaving, they threatened to kill him. After some time, the son of his bua (aunt) namely Satyawan came there. Satyawan, Ramesh, Binu and son of the maternal uncle of the complainant namely Neema took care of the complainant. Ramesh son of Dharam Singh took him to General Hospital, Safidon in his vehicle. The complainant was referred to PGI Rohtak due to serious injuries. On the basis of complainant's statement, FIR was registered. The matter was investigated. During treatment, the complainant expired on 08.07.2021 at PGI Rohtak.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that the appellant was attributed an injury with a danda blow on the stomach of the complainant and on account of perforation, the complainant passed away. He contends that at this stage, he wishes to advance arguments for grant of bail only on the basis of period of custody undergone by the appellant. It is contended that the appellant has clean antecedents and was 18 years of age at the time of registration of FIR; has undergone actual sentence of 04 years 08 months and 08 days as on 02.04.2026. Learned counsel further contends that only 20 out of 30 witnesses have been examined so far.

4. On the other hand, State counsel contends that the fatal injury has been attributed to the appellant. He, however, does not dispute that the



appellant has clean antecedents and only 20 out of 30 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the actual period of custody undergone by the appellant, which is more than 04 years and 08 months as on date and the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future as well as clean antecedents, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the appellant on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the appellant shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

06.04.2026
sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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