



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

212

CRM-M-32619-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.07.2026

SANDEEP AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishwajeet, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short the 'BNSS') is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.343 dated 27.10.2025 registered under Sections 191(3), 190, 115, 110, 126, 351(3) of BNS (offence under Sections 61, 117 (2) of BNS added subsequently) at Police Station Thanesar City, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1).

2. On the statement of one Vikas Kumar, the FIR in question was registered. As per the allegations, on 25.10.2025, the complainant was attacked by 5/6 unknown persons with sticks, as a result of which, he suffered grievous injuries in the form of fractures on his arms. The complainant named Sachin Gujjar and Abhishek Kumar. The petitioners were nominated as accused on the basis of a disclosure statement of co-accused Sachin Gujjar and were arrested. Petitioner Sandeep was arrested on 14.11.2025, whereas petitioner Dharampal 03.11.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that they have been

falsely implicated. He submits that none of the petitioners were named in the FIR and were nominated later on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. He further submits that they are in custody for the last almost 8 months; final report stands submitted; charges stand framed but no prosecution witness has been examined till date. He submits that under the circumstances, trial will take a sufficiently long time and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the bail application stating that the allegations are very serious and grievous injuries were inflicted upon the person of the complainant by the accused. It has been submitted that if the petitioners are released on bail, they may try to influence and threaten the witnesses and may also abscond.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Concededly, the petitioners were not named in the FIR, though they were nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Sachin Gujjar. The complainant suffered grievous injuries on his arms as there were fractures on the same on account of he having been beaten up by sticks. As to whether the petitioners were involved or not, shall be determined once the trial concludes. The petitioner Sandeep is in custody since 14.11.2025 and Dharampal since 03.11.2025, final report has been submitted; no recovery has to be made; charges have been framed but no witness has been examined till date, trial will take a sufficiently long time. In the considered opinion of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners in custody any longer.

7. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.
8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

July 03, 2026
Mani Kumar

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