



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.68787 of 2025

Sagar @ Bachha @ Sagar Rajoria ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	16.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	18.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	18.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Shiv Kumar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the

2026:PHHC:025799



petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.83 dated 27.06.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 117(2), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 333, 351(3) and 61(2) of the BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Tigaon, District Faridabad.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant – Nitin Nagar, alleging that on 26.06.2025, some persons had opened an assault upon his father-Sumer Singh Nagar in pursuance of a pre-planned conspiracy and had caused serious injuries to him. His father was admitted in hospital and was not in a position to make statement. He also submitted some videos capturing the surroundings of the place of occurrence, showing some of the assailants and also showing the suspicious vehicles. He disclosed that persons of separate groups had been extending threats to his father and also took the names of some of those persons.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 25.07.2025 and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime by saying that on asking of Nagendra @ Naggi, maternal uncle of accused Mohit, to make arrangements for some persons who could assault the victim Sumer Nagar, he had joined his friends along with him. On 26.06.2025, he had gone to the plot of the victim along with the co-accused. He along with the co-accused had inflicted injuries on the person of the victim with iron rods and hammer whereas accused Mohit who had gone with them had kept sitting in the vehicle that was taken by him to

2026:PHHC:025799



the place of occurrence. The other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR and has been implicated later on. No specific overt act, injury or weapon has been attributed to him. He is in custody since long. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The co-accused Mohit has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused had gone to the place of occurrence along with them and had caused injuries on the person of the victim with an intent to kill him. The victim had sustained as many as 11 injuries and was still on bed. The petitioner was shown to be present at the place of occurrence in the CCTV footage of the camera installed in the vicinity. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common

2026:PHHC:025799



object thereof, he along with them is alleged to have gone to the place of occurrence and to have assaulted the victim who has sustained serious injuries and is still stated to be bed ridden. The victim had sustained multiple fractures on different parts of his body. The iron rod used by the petitioner in the crime has been recovered at his instance. The petitioner is a habitual offender as he is shown to be involved in one case of murder. No doubt, he was not named in the FIR but was named by the co-accused Mohit and he is also seen in the CCTV footage. His case cannot be stated to be at parity with the case of co-accused Mohit. The allegations make out a prima facie case qua his complicity in the subject crime. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. The victim and other material witnesses are yet to be examined. The allegations that he may abscond cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the material witnesses are also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered.

8. In light of the foregoing legal principles and other circumstances as discussed above, this Court finds no compelling ground to allow this petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.



9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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