

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113

2026:PHHC:032229



CRM-M-66954-2025 (O&M).
Date of decision: 27.02.2026.

MUKESH ALIAS LAVKUSH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ajay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the third petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.327 dated 05.04.2022, under Section(s) 323, 341, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Section 302 of the IPC added and Section 120-B of the IPC deleted later on), registered at Police Station HTM Hisar, District Hisar (Haryana).

Facts in brief are that the present case was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely Poonam, wife of Balwan, resident of

Street No. 14, Surya Nagar, Hisar. The complainant submitted that she has a daughter and a son named Sunny. On 05.04.2022, at about 08:00 AM, she had gone to the neighbourhood to pay a loan instalment. On hearing the noise of a quarrel, she returned home and saw that her neighbour Birmati along with her two sons, had been beating Sunny in the street. They caused injuries to Sunny with rods, dandas and bricks. When she intervened, all three of them assaulted her by hitting her on the head with an iron rod, gave danda blows on her arm, hit on her head with bricks and threatened her with dire consequences. When the injured persons were about to go inside the house, the three assailants wrongfully restrained them and inflicted further injuries as a result of which they fell unconscious in the street. Thereafter, the culprits fled from the spot. On the basis of the aforesaid facts, the complainant sought legal action against the accused persons.

After recording of the statement of the complainant, the FIR was registered under Section 323, 341, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. However, later on injured Sunny passed away during treatment at PGIMS Rohtak on account of the injuries sustained in the above said incident and consequently offence under Section 302 IPC was added and the petitioner was taken in custody.

State counsel at the very outset, submits that out of a total 23 witnesses cited by the prosecution, 22 witnesses already stand examined. She further contends that the entire prosecution evidence shall be concluded either by the next date of hearing fixed before the trial Court and in any case not later than one month from the date fixed next before the trial Court for recording of remaining prosecution evidence.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into

consideration the fact that the case is already at an advanced stage and the prosecution evidence is nearly complete and only one witness remains to be examined, the present petition is **dismissed** at this stage. However, considering the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner and that the petitioner has been seeking expeditious adjudication and conclusion of the proceedings, trial Court is directed to make every endeavour and to take appropriate steps to conclude the prosecution evidence within a period of one month from the date next fixed before the trial Court for recording of the evidence of the prosecution.

February 27, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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