

2. Learned counsel for the appellant contends that from a bare perusal of the FIR (Annexure A-1), it is evident that the appellant was not named in the FIR and no specific role has been attributed to him. Even one injury was declared previous, which is also attributed to his co-accused. Apart from that, in the present case, Ashish @ Dangi, Ankit @ Minda, Upender @ Navneet @ Noni, Dipender and Ajay have already been granted the concession of bail by

this Court as well as the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar. The appellant was arrested in the present case on 16.05.2026 and is in custody since then. Even the injured in the present case have already been discharged from the hospital.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present appellant and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He further submits that respondent/complainant in the present case has been informed by the concerned SHO, still there is no representation on his behalf.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. It is not in dispute that the appellant was not initially named in the FIR and has been nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement of his co-accused. Even similarly placed co-accused, namely, Ashish @ Dangi, Ankit @ Minda, Upender @ Navneet @ Noni, Dipender and Ajay have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court as well as the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
hemlata

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