



CRM-M-69878-2025

1

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

Sr. No.112

CRM-M-69878-2025

Date of Decision: 27.02.2026

RAHUL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Manoj Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 173 dated 08.08.2025 registered under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 190, 191(3), 324(5), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 16/177 of the Motor Vehicles Act (added later on), registered at Police Station Sector-17, District Faridabad.

2. Brief facts of the case, as emanate from the record, are that the present FIR was registered on the application of complainant Pankaj Singh dated 07.08.2025. The complainant alleged that about two months prior thereto, he had made a complaint regarding electricity theft against Tota Ram (his grandfather-in-law) to the Electricity Department and due to the said dispute, enmity had developed. It was alleged that on the previous day, Sunny (a relative of his wife) and Gaurav (his brother-in-law) threatened



him over a telephonic call and asked him to come to Kheri Pul. The complainant further stated that he reached near Kheri Pul in his vehicle and saw Sunny present there along with other vehicles. Sensing danger, he immediately turned his vehicle and proceeded towards Ballabgarh via the bypass road. It is alleged that the accused persons started chasing him in their vehicles. When he reached near the Delhi-Mumbai Expressway, Sunny allegedly overtook his vehicle and fired upon him with the intention to kill. The complainant tried to escape but his vehicle got damaged. It is further alleged that Sunny again attempted to fire, though no bullet came out thereafter. The complainant somehow managed to flee from the spot and informed the police regarding the incident, on the basis of which the present FIR was registered and investigation commenced. The present petitioner Rahul is named in the FIR. As per the allegations, he was accompanying co-accused Sunny in his Harrier vehicle, participated in chasing the complainant's vehicle.

3. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 12.08.2025 and has undergone approximately six months of incarceration. Learned counsel submits that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the only allegation against him is that he was sitting in the car of co-accused Sunny, who is stated to be the main accused. It is further argued that nothing was recovered from the petitioner during investigation and that investigation qua him stands complete and challan has already been presented. It is also contended that the present case is a case of version and cross-version arising out of



previous enmity and that the main accused Sunny has already been granted bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court. On the ground of parity and in view of the fact that no overt act or injury has been specifically attributed to him, the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application and submitted that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. It is argued that as per the allegations, he was present along with the main accused Sunny at the time of the incident, was sitting in Sunny's car and actively participated in chasing the complainant. It is further submitted that all the accused persons fired upon the complainant with the intention to kill him and the petitioner, being part of the unlawful assembly and accompanying the main accused, cannot escape liability. Therefore, it is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court finds that the main accused Sunny has already been granted bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court. The present case appears to be a case of version and cross-version arising out of prior enmity. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the primary allegation against him is that he was accompanying the main accused. The petitioner is in custody for the last about six months and the trial is likely to take time to conclude. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing adequate bail



CRM-M-69878-2025 4

bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

27.02.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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