

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:024249



231

CRM-M-69111-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:17.02.2026

Abhishek @ Bilu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Ruby Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.179, dated 05.07.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 109(1), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, at Police Station Baldev Nagar, Ambala, District Ambala.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant – Raghwinder Singh on 05.07.2025, alleging therein that in the morning of 04.07.2025, he was going towards Ambala City in his motorbike when a white coloured car came from behind. There were three occupants in the same. They directly hit his motorbike from behind with an intent to kill him. He had fallen down along with his

bike. They alighted from the vehicle. They were with muffled faces and opened an attack upon him with sticks and rods. He rushed for his rescue and somehow entered in the premises of Saint Paul School and saved himself. He identified one of them as Abhishek @ Bilu S/o Anil Kumar i.e. the present petitioner. By alleging that the petitioner and his father were nursing grudges against him from the last two months and had previously extended threats to him and they in connivance with each other had made an attempt to kill him, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 16.07.2025. Investigation now stands completed. The petitioner along with co-accused is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Co-accused Anil Kumar i.e. the father of the petitioner has been found to be innocent. Co-accused Nitesh and Abhishek Walia have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. The injuries sustained by the victim have not been opined to be dangerous to life. The victim-complainant stands examined before the learned trial Court and has not supported the prosecution version and has not implicated him in the commission of subject offences. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. He is on bail in most of the cases as registered against him. It is, thus, argued that the petitioner deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has not raised any serious objections to the pleas as taken by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel has however argued that there are direct allegations against the petitioner, who in connivance with the co-accused, had voluntarily caused hurt to the victim with an intent to kill him and had also tried to run over him by his vehicle. He has criminal antecedents There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record a copy of sworn deposition of the complainant – Raghwinder Singh as recorded before the learned trial Court on 22.01.2026 and a perusal of the same reveals that the complainant did not implicate the petitioner in the commission of subject offences and has not identified him as one of the assailants. The petitioner is in custody since 16.07.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Taking into consideration the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of evidence, which has come on record in the form of sworn testimony of the complainant and attendants facts and circumstances of the case, but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty

Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

17.02.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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