



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

235

CRM-M-62517-2025**Date of Decision:-12.01.2026****SAGAR****.....PETITIONER****VS.****STATE OF HARYANA****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Bindu Tanwar, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J.(ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.239 dated 02.11.2024 under Sections 115, 190, 191(3) and 351 of BNS (later on Section 109(1), 110, 115(2), 117(2), 126, 126(2), 238, 351(2), 61(2) of BNS were added) registered at Police Station Barara, District Ambala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that, as per the allegations, the petitioner along with co-accused allegedly inflicted injuries on the head of the complainant with iron rods and other weapons. However, it is stated that the head injuries were found to be simple in nature. He further submits that the co-accused, namely Dharmender Singh @ Gonu, Govind @ Govinda, Sawraj Singh @ Titu and Abhishek Singh @ Happy have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 01.08.2025, 28.10.2025, 10.11.2025 and 04.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-40396-2025, CRM-M-58432-



2025, CRM-M-33214-2025 and CRM-M-43472-2025 respectively and role of the petitioner is on same footing as of other co-accused. He also submits that petitioner is in custody since 13.11.2024 i.e. for the last about 01 year and 02 months and he is not involved in one other criminal case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner along with co-accused caused grievous injuries to the complainant with iron rods and other weapons. Present petitioner actively participated in the commission of offence, however, he fairly concedes that the petitioner is only involved in one other case and prayed for dismissal of his bail. However, he does not dispute the fact that other co-accused, namely, Dharmender Singh @ Gonu, Govind @ Govinda, Sawraj Singh @ Titu and Abhishek Singh @ Happy have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case; role attributed to the petitioner; he is in custody since 13.11.2024 i.e for the last about 01 year and 02 months; and other co-accused, namely Dharmender Singh @ Gonu, Govind @ Govinda, Sawraj Singh @ Titu and Abhishek Singh @ Happy have already been granted bail; the case of the petitioner is on same footing as of other co-accused; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and



it is trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

12.01.2026
Kusum

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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