



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CRM-M-48848-2025
Decided on : 21.05.2026

MONU ALIAS SAHIL

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Monu alias Sahil, aged about 21 years	757	03.10.2023	147, 148, 149, 324, 307, 120-B of IPC and section 25(1-a)b of Arms Act	Azad Nagar	Hisar

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner’s first bail petition, i.e. CRM-M-54783-2024, was dismissed, vide order dated 11.11.2024 (Annexure P-3), primarily on the ground that an eye-witness, namely Chhindo, had not been examined at that stage.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that both the eye-witnesses, i.e. Chhindo and injured-Gaurav (son of Chhindo), have now been examined and have supported the case of prosecution.

4. Without delving into the merits of the case, counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody for a period of approximately two years and six months. It is further submitted that, out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, only 07 have been examined, so far. Thus, prayer is made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the status report dated 27.04.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner is one of the main accused who played active role in the commission of crime, and caused injuries to the injured Gaurav with a knife, with the intention to kill him. Due to the stab injury in the abdomen, the intestines of the injured Gaurav protruded.

However, he does not dispute the fact that, as of now, both the injured Gourav and his mother, namely Chhindo, have been examined before the trial Court and have supported the prosecution case. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.



7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

8. Injuries suffered by the injured namely Gaurav are mentioned here under:-

Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury number
1.	AN INCISED WOUND OF SIZE 7 CM X 2CM PRESENT OVER LEFT SIDE ABDOMEN, INTESTINE COMES OUT FROM WOUND. ADV. GEN. SURGEON OPINION	No	1
2.	INCISED WOUND OF SIZE 3CM X 0.5 CM OVER LEFT THIGH FRONT PART. ADV. ORTHO OPINION	No	2
3.	MULTIPLE STAB WOUND OF VARIABLE SIZE RANGING FROM 1.5CM X 0.5CM TO 5CM X 1CM PRESENT OVER B/L BUTTOCKS AND B/L THIGHS. ADV. ORTHO OPINION	No	3
4.	ANY INJURY FOUND DURING TREATMENT CAN BE ADDED LATER ON	No	4

9. Undoubtedly, both the eye-witnesses have fully supported the case of the prosecution. However, only seven out of total 21 prosecution witnesses have been examined till date, and petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of two years and six months.

Therefore, in view of the totality of the circumstances, facts and allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.

10. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief



CRM-M-48848-2025

4

Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

13. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO