



CRM-M-67364-2025 &
CRM-M-71683-2025

-1-

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

117 Kamal Giri State of Haryana	Versus	CRM-M-67364-2025 (O&M) Date of Decision: 01.04.2026 Petitioner Respondent
---	---------------	---

117a Karan Kumar State of Haryana	Versus	CRM-M-71683-2025 Date of Decision: 01.04.2026 Petitioner Respondent
---	---------------	---

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Krishan M. Vohra, Advocate, for the petitioner
in CRM-M-67364-2025.
Mr. Bijender Dhankar, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-71683-2025.
Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

CRM-48254-2025 in CRM-M-67364-2025

Allowed as prayed for. Annexures P-1 to P-6 are taken on record.

Main cases

1. By this order, the two above-mentioned petitions are disposed of, both having arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Prayer in the present petitions is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.22 dated 03.02.2025 under Sections 109(1), 115, 118(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 324 of BNS and Sections 29 and 30 of Arms Act added lateron) at Police Station Sector-7, Panchkula
3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Kamal Devi. It was alleged that



CRM-M-67364-2025 &
CRM-M-71683-2025

-2-

on 02.02.2025, her son Rahul, aged 23 years, went to attend a wedding in their colony. She received information that Rahul had been injured and taken to Civil Hospital, Sector 6, Panchkula. When she reached the hospital, Rahul informed her that after the food at the wedding was finished, he and his friend Honey went to Kamal Dhaba in Khadak Mangoli to eat. However, a quarrel broke out with Kamal, the owner of the dhaba, over payment, following which Kamal called his son Deepak and three other boys. Thereafter, they assaulted Rahul and Deepak stabbed Rahul in his stomach with knife and one of them fired a shot on him. Owing to the severity of his pain as his intestine came out due to stabbing, Rahul was unable to provide her with much details. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioners, namely, Kamal Giri (petitioner in CRM-M-67364-2025) and Karan Kumar (CRM-M-71683-2025) surfaced and they were arrested on 03.02.2025. They approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide order dated 13.11.2025 and 12.11.2023, respectively. Earlier, petitioner Karan Kumar approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-17501-2025 and CRM-M-32363-2025, however, the same were dismissed vide separate orders dated 29.04.2025 and 04.09.2025. Hence, petitioner Karan Kumar has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third petition, whereas, petitioner Kamal Giri has approached this Court by way of filing the present



CRM-M-67364-2025 &
CRM-M-71683-2025

-3-

first petition.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They submit that the alleged occurrence took place on 02.02.2025 and the petitioners were arrested on 03.02.2025.

It is submitted by learned counsel for petitioner Karan Kumar that petitioner had been alleged to have caught hold the injured, Rahul. However, neither he was armed with any weapon nor any injury has been attributed to him.

Learned counsel for petitioner Kamal Giri has submitted that petitioner had been alleged to have given bottle blow to Honey on his head, however, injured Honey was not even medically examined.

To buttress their arguments, they submits that complainant Kamal Devi and injured Rahul have not supported the case of the prosecution and they have been turned hostile. It is further contended by them that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents, as they have never been involved in any other criminal case. It is, thus, submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. It is submitted that the petitioners have played an active role in the commission of offence. It is contended that the injured suffered five injuries, which are the stab wounds. On instructions, he submits that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, four witnesses have been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody



CRM-M-67364-2025 &
CRM-M-71683-2025

-4-

certificates of the petitioners.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners were alleged to be part of the unlawful assembly. The alleged injury attributed to petitioner Kamal Giri is a bottle blow, whereas, petitioner Karan Kumar was alleged to have caught hold the injured. The custody certificates of the petitioners would show that they have suffered incarceration of 01 year, 01 months & 28 days as on 31.03.2026 and they have no criminal antecedents. Out of 19 prosecution witnesses, four witnesses have been examined till date, out of them material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

01.04.2026

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No