



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

CRM-M-71465-2025

Date of decision : 23.04.2026

Krishna @ Krishan Kumar Singh @ Krishna Kumar Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ashok Jindal, Advocate and
Mr. Ayush Tyagi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0152 dated 29.07.2025, under Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 109, 115(2), 117(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sector-17/18, Gurugram.

2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Rani wife of Komal. It was alleged that on 28.07.2025 at about 09.30 PM, the complainant sent her daughter, namely, Laxmi to purchase some grossery where a verbal fight took place with one Dev Kumar, upon an amount of Rs.50/-. It was alleged that the complainant's daughter called her there and Dev Kumar, started pushing the complainant and her daughter and also gave them beatings. It was alleged that brother of Dev Kumar, namely, Sandeep, Krishan (present petitioner) and 3-5 young boys armed with *danda* came there and complainant's husband, namely, Komal along with Tinku, Ravinder and Vikas also reached there. It was further alleged that Dev Kumar, Sandeep and Krishan along with 3-4 other boys started beating them and Sandeep



gave a *danda* blow on the head of Tinku. When people gathered there, accused persons fled away from the spot with their respective weapons. Thereafter, injured persons got admitted in the Hospital. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. On completion of investigation, challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 01.08.2025. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 01.12.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner along with co-accused has been alleged to have caused fist blows to injured-Tinku. He submits that the alleged injury under Section 307 IPC is attributed to co-accused, namely, Sandeep and not to the petitioner. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars from last about 09 months. He, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner with a common intention with co-accused had caused serious injuries to Tinku. He submits that though the petitioner is alleged to have given fist blows, however, co-accused Sandeep was armed with Danda, who had caused head injury to injured-Tinku. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been



examined so far. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was alleged to have given fist blows. The injury caused under Section 307 IPC, is attributed to co-accused and not to the petitioner. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 08 months and 21 days as on 21.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.04.2026
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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