



135

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

CRM-M No.70238 of 2025

Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

Niranjan Singh Bagel @ Baba

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.206, dated 26.04.2023, under Sections 307, 323, 34 of IPC (Section 324 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Adarsh Nagar, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sahil Kumar. It was alleged that on 26.04.2023, there was a quarrel between the friend of complainant, namely, Mohit and Niranjan @ Baba (petitioner) and at about 06:00 P.M., the complainant, Mohit, Kirpal and Atul were going to our Institute through City Park Ballabhgarh, then, inside the park, Niranjan @ Baba (petitioner) along with two other boys were hiding.



Niranjan @ Baba with the intention to kill Mohit, stabbed him directly in the stomach with a knife. When the complainant tried to save Mohit, Niranjan @ Baba also attacked on his right hand with the knife, due to which, the complainant got injured. As the Mohit was stabbed in the stomach, his intestines had come out. Thereafter, the complainant raised alarm and when the crowd gathered, the accused fled away from the spot along with their weapons. Mohit got admitted in the hospital for treatment. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against both the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 27.04.2023. On completion of the investigation, the challan has been presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad 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, Faridabad dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 04.06.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner and the complainant side, both are students. He has submitted that the alleged occurrence has taken place on the way to the Institute. He has submitted that out of total 03 accused, rest of 02 of the co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that the petitioner is a teenager, who has no criminal



antecedents. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 2½ years. He has submitted that the material witnesses, i.e. the injured and the complainant have already been examined and thus, there is no probability of the petitioner influencing the complainant. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner was not only armed with the knife, but he had caused the injury in the abdomen of injured, namely, Mohit as well as to the complainant. She has submitted that the injury attributed to Mohit was declared dangerous to life. She has submitted that the co-accused, who have been granted the concession of bail, were the juveniles and their case is distinguishable from that of the petitioner. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. She, on instructions, has further submitted that the complainant and the injured, both stand examined and they have supported the case of the prosecution. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner and the complainant side, both are students. The occurrence taken place on the way of the institute. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 27.04.2023. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 02 years, 10 months and 18 days as on 14.03.2026. It



further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. The material witnesses, i.e. the complainant and the injured, already stand examined.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695** has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in '**Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024**', has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

16.03.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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