



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

239

**CRM-M No.67529 of 2025
Date of decision : 12.1.2026
Date of uploading: 13.1.2026**

Amarjeet**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Kashyap, Advocate, for the complainant

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.62 dated 8.3.2025, under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 109, 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(1)B, 25(1)C of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3) of BNS deleted and Section 25(1)C of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Jind, District Jind.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

'Subject: Application for taking action against 1. Ansh alias Lucky son of Praveen, 2. Praveen son unknown, 3. Harsh son Praveen, 4. Deepak son



unknown residents of Shiv Colony, Jind and 3-4 other unknown boys for attempt to murder and causing injury.

Sir,

The applicant submits as under:-

1. That I, the applicant Ravi son Ramniwas, am a permanent resident of house no. 802-803, New Housing Board, Jind and am preparing the papers for a job. I am 29 years old.

2. That on 04.03.2025, I had gone to Mahendra Shiv Colony shop to buy grocery items in the afternoon, when Ansh alias Lucky son of Praveen resident of Shiv Colony Jind along with his 3-4 friends thrashed me and threatened to kill me, which was an altercation between Ansh and my brother Narendra eight-nine days back regarding speeding of bike, after which I was admitted in Government Hospital Jind for one day and gave my statement to the police for action.

3. Today on 08.03.2025 at about 05.15 P.M., I was going towards old bus stand Jind on scooty with my nephew Aditya, then a little ahead of Mahendra's shop, the above-mentioned Ansh son of Praveen and his three friends came in front of my scooty and blocked my car, the number of the car was HR26CG-1822. Ansh pointed a pistol at me, and I drove off my scooter and ran towards home, then Ansh challenged me saying that he would kill me when I come home. I came home and told the entire thing to my family and was going towards my uncle Ramesh's house for further proceedings, when my brother Vivek Sharma, a lawyer, my brother Narendra and my Rachna and me, Ansh's father Praveen, uncle Deepak and Ansh's elder brother Harsh surrounded us outside my uncle Ramesh's house and attacked us with sticks, Ansh's father Praveen strangled my brother Narendra and hit him, Praveen also hit my brother Vivek with a stick and abused him with filthy language. At the same time Ansh son of Praveen also reached there with his 3-4 friends in car no. HR-26CG-1822 and Ansh fired at me with the intention to kill me and my mother came in between and Ansh missed the target and my mother got hit by the pellets. Then Ansh's friend fired at my brother Vivek with the intention to kill him but my brother Narendra caught him from behind and he missed the target, otherwise the bullet would have hit my brother Vivek. Then all the accused started firing in the air and hearing the fight many people gathered. Who were Ansh alias Lucky, Praveen, Harsh, Deepak and others Two-three persons blocked my way by parking their vehicle in front of me



and in collusion with each other fired at me and my brother Vivek with the intention of killing me and injured my other family members and threatened to kill me and all of them fled from the spot with their weapons. Necessary legal action should be taken against all of them.

Sd/- Ravi Applicant Ravi son of Shri Ramniwas House No. 802-803, New Housing Board Jind Mobile No. 9467815900 Date 08.03.2025.'

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 9.3.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question by the police. Learned counsel has further argued that the matter has been amicably settled between the rival parties, terms whereof have been reduced into writing in the shape of compromise deed dated 26.9.2025 (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-6 alongwith the present petition). Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 10.1.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

4.1 Learned counsel for the complainant has filed his *vakalatnama*, which is taken on record, and ratified the veracity of the compromise deed dated 26.9.2025 (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-6 alongwith the present petition) entered into between the parties.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 9.3.2025 whereinafter



investigation was carried out and challan was presented in the case on 2.5.2025. Total 17 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is, thus indubitable that conclusion of the trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised at the Bar; including the veracity/weightage required to be attached to the compromise deed 26.9.2025 (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-6 alongwith the present petition); shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 10.1.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of about 10 months and 01 day. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 7 more cases/FIRs. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd.*

Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal)



586; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those



which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
- 11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

12.1.2026
Ashwani

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