



125

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

**CRM-M No.70374 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.02.2026**

Ravinder @ Binder

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. D. S. Matya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

CRM-51240-2025

CRM-51616-2025

Both the applications are allowed as prayed for. Documents, Annexures P-14 to P-20 and P-21 to P-22 are ordered to be taken on record.

CRM-51241-2025

CRM-51617-2025

Both the applications are allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-70374-2025

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.401, dated 11.07.2024, under Sections 103(1) r/w Sections 3(5), 61 and 253 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Hansi, District Hisar.



2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ct. Jagdeep Singh. It was alleged that the complainant was deputed as Gunman of Ravinder Saini, who was the owner of Hero Motorcycle agency. It was alleged that on 10.07.2024, at about 06:00 P.M., the complainant along with Ravinder Saini was present in the office. In the meantime, Ravinder Saini went out of the showroom for attending a phone call. Just after one or two minutes, the complainant heard the noise of firing and, thus, he immediately went out. He found that Ravinder Saini was lying in an injured condition on the ground. The complainant saw that three young boys, aged about 25-30 years running towards Hisar and one motorcyclist was also there with them. All of them fled away from the spot. He saw that Ravinder Saini was shot on the head and abdomen and the blood was oozing from the injuries. Ravinder Saini was immediately taken to Government Hospital, Hansi by the complainant and son of Ravinder Saini, namely, Deepanshu, where he was declared dead. The complainant further alleged that Ravinder Saini had earlier revealed to him that one Vikas @ Vicky had once fired bullet upon him. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against Vikas @ Vicky. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner, namely, Ravinder @ Binder surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, Vikas @ Vicky, and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 15.07.2024.

The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge,



Hisar praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 03.12.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Vicky. He has further submitted that the co-accused, namely, Parveen, who has been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, has also arrayed as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement. He, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Parveen. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 20.11.2025, passed in **CRM-M-25650-2025**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Parveen has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 15.07.2024. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He has submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State however has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted



that complicity of the petitioner surfaced during the investigation on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He, however, has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Parveen. He, on instructions from SI Rampal, has submitted that out of total 51 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 15.07.2024. Petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Vicky. Co-accused, namely, Parveen, who was also arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Vicky, is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with Parveen. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 07 months and 04 days as on 26.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases, however in 01 of the case, he is on bail. Out of total 51 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined so far.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned



counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.02.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No