

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

2026:PHHC:024635



217

CRM-M-68498-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.02.2026
Date of uploading: 17.02.2026

Ravinder Kali @ Rajput

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.257 dated 21.09.2014 registered for offences punishable under Sections, 148/149/323/427/307/452 IPC & Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that on 20.09.2014, the police received information that certain miscreants had attacked the owners of Dark Knight Café situated on Morni Road with swords and *dandas* and had fired upon them with an intention to kill. Upon receipt of the said

information, the police officials reached the spot and found the gate of the restaurant closed. They further received information that one Kapil had been admitted to Alchemist Hospital, Sector 21, Panchkula, having sustained injuries in the incident. The medical ruqqa was collected and the police proceeded to the hospital, where the statement of the injured was recorded on 21.09.2014 after obtaining medical opinion regarding his fitness to make a statement. Complainant Kapil stated that he had been running Dark Knight Café since 12.09.2014 along with his partners, namely Raja Bhaiya, Nikhil and himself. As per routine, he was present at the restaurant at about 2:50 a.m. on 20.09.2014 along with his friends Gaurav, Raghav, Vishan, Nikhil, Raja Bhaiya and Ravi. At about 3:00 a.m., while he was conversing on his mobile phone, 10–12 boys arrived in Verna and Scorpio vehicles and entered the restaurant. He identified some of them as persons of criminal antecedents, including Monty Shah and Shonki, who were armed with pistols, and Pisa, Kaliya, Parry, Mani, Janed and Daman, who were armed with swords and baseball bats. It was alleged that Monty Shah and Shonki fired shots with an intention to kill. The complainant and his companions attempted to escape; however, Kapil, Raghav and Gaurav sustained injuries, while others fled. It was further alleged that the assailants proclaimed that they had come to kill the complainant, who was apprehended by Daman, Lakshay and Kaliya, residents of Chandigarh. The complainant stated that there had been a prior dispute between the assailants and his friend Sunil Bhanot about a year earlier, which had led to a grudge. He alleged that before fleeing, the assailants snatched his mobile phone, money, gold chain and gold earring,

set ablaze his friend's car, and caused damage to the restaurant. Believing him to be dead, they fled the scene. Raghav and Gaurav thereafter got him admitted to the hospital. During investigation, the police recovered a live cartridge, two empty cartridges and bloodstained sand from the spot. As per the medico-legal report, the complainant had sustained injuries including a gunshot wound and fractures of the tibia, patella, hands and foot. A Special Investigation Team (SIT) was constituted. On 06.01.2015, accused Manmeet Singh @ Pisa was arrested and made a disclosure statement alleging that the attack was carried out at the instance of Inderpreet @ Parry to take revenge. The place of occurrence was demarcated and a Scorpio vehicle along with an iron rod was recovered. Upon medical opinion, Section 326 IPC was added. Subsequently, on the basis of disclosure statements made in another case, Amandeep Joshi @ Rajbir Joshi was arrested on 19.02.2015, and he named Vineet Saini, Manpreet Singh @ Mani and Karmanjeet Singh @ Rana as co-accused. Baseball bats and a *danda* used in the occurrence were recovered. Inderpreet @ Parry was arrested on 19.03.2015 and disclosed that the complainant had allegedly set his Verna car on fire in August 2014, and in order to avenge the same, he along with his associates conspired to attack the complainant. He also named Monty Shah, Manmeet Singh @ Pisa, Amandeep Joshi @ Rajbir, Manpreet Singh @ Mani, Vineet Saini, Karmanjeet Singh, Atinder Pal Singh @ Gaman @ Daman and Ravinder Singh @ Kaliya @ Kali. It was further alleged that he had conspired with Lawrence Bishnoi while in jail, pursuant to which associates were sent to execute the attack. Accordingly, Section 120-B IPC was added. The

vehicle used in the occurrence was recovered, and Lawrence Bishnoi was arrested on 28.03.2015. Section 201 IPC was also added during investigation. The petitioner was arrested on 28.04.2015, and pursuant to his disclosure statement, a sword allegedly used in the occurrence was recovered. The petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 06.10.2017, whereupon FIR No. 296 of 2020 under Section 174-A IPC, Police Station Chandimandir, was registered against him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was initially arrested on 28.04.2015 whereinafter he was extended the concession of regular bail by this Court on 02.12.2016 (Annexure P-2). The petitioner continued to appear before the concerned trial Court till May, 2017 whereinafter he could not appear due to miscommunication between him and his counsel appearing before the trial court and subsequently the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender on 06.10.2017. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner came to be re-arrested on 31.08.2020 and is in continuous custody since then. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and, hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 15.02.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

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

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner came to be arrested on 28.04.2015 whereinafter he was granted the concession of regular bail by this Court on 02.12.2016. Though the petitioner is stated to be absconded from May, 2017 till August, 2020, the petitioner has suffered total incarceration for a period of more than 5 years & 5 months. In the considered opinion of this Court no useful purpose would be served by further detention of the petitioner. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon 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. Indubitably, the present petition is the third attempt on behalf of the petitioner for securing regular bail. The last one bearing no. CRM-M-29395-2025 was dismissed as withdrawn on 26.11.2025 (Annexure P-12). However, keeping in view the entirety of facts and circumstance of the case in hand especially keeping in view the extended custody and pace of trial, this Court is inclined to favourably consider the instant plea for bail. A profitable reference, in this regard, can be made to a judgment of this Court passed in **CRA-S-2332-2023** titled as ***Rafiq Khan versus State of Haryana and another***; relevant whereof reads as under:

“10. As an epilogue to the above discussion, the following principles emerge:

I Second/successive regular bail petition(s) filed is maintainable in law & hence such petition ought not to be rejected solely on the ground of maintainability thereof.

II. Such second/successive regular bail petition(s) is maintainable whether earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or earlier petition was dismissed on merits.

III For the second/successive regular bail petition(s) to succeed, the petitioner/applicant shall be essentially/pertinently required to show substantial change in circumstances and showing of a mere superficial or ostensible change would not suffice. The metaphoric expression of seeking second/successive bail plea(s) ought not be abstracted into literal iterations of petition(s) without substantial, effective and consequential change in circumstances.

IV No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute substantial change in circumstances as every case has its own unique facts/circumstance. Making such an attempt is nothing but an utopian endeavour. Ergo, this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such second/successive regular bail petition(s).

V In case a Court chooses to grant second/successive regular bail petition(s), cogent and lucid reasons are pertinently required to be recorded for granting such plea despite such a plea being second/successive petition(s). In other words, the cause for a Court having successfully countenanced/entertained such second/successive petition(s) ought to be readily and clearly decipherable from the said order passed.”

6.2. As per the custody certificate dated 15.02.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for 5 years, 5 months & 16 days and is shown to be involved in multiple other cases/FIRs. 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, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned 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/Illaq 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. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 17, 2026
Naveen

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