

138/2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH



CRA-S-3048-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

ANIL @ BHOLA ... APPELLANT
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Ms. Vidushi Singh, Advocate for
Ms. Diepa Singh, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate with
Mr. K.P.Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant is aggrieved by the order dated 06.09.2025 passed by learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Faridabad, whereby his application for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 83 dated 07.05.2025, under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 3(5), 351(2), 61(2), 110 and 238 of BNS and Section 3/33/89 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 registered at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad (Haryana) has been dismissed.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the appellant gave a phone call to the complainant, namely Dharampal before attacking him along with two other persons armed with dandas for taking fights with Sumer, who was stated to be the main accused. It is stated that the appellant had inflicted blows with iron rod on the legs of the complainant while using derogatory remarks on his caste.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been implicated falsely in the present case. The appellant is in custody for the last 09 months and 10 days.

4. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant oppose the prayer for grant of regular bail to the appellant on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the appellant is in custody for the last 09 months and 10 days. The appellant is also involved in 08 other cases.

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

6. The appellant broke the right leg of the complainant with a rod, due to which he fell on the ground. He is involved in eight other cases, which indicates that he does not have clean antecedents. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the allegations, the appellant is not entitled to the concession of bail. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, no exceptional or extraordinary grounds are made out for granting regular bail to the appellant.

7. Dismissed.

8. However, the appellant shall be at liberty to move a fresh application for bail in case the trial does not make substantial progress in a reasonable time.

10.03.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No