



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

117

CRM-M-72180-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 14.05.2026

Ravi alias Mota

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0248 dated 30.06.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 351(2), 324(4), 333, 3(5), 61(2), 11(2b) of BNS at Police Station City Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for about 9 months. The injuries alleged to have been inflicted were on the non-vital parts. Charges have been framed on 24.12.2025 and complainant stands examined, however, 10 remain. The petitioner is on bail in 8 other cases. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382. He undertakes that the petitioner will not extend any threat to the complainant and his family.

3. The custody certificate dated 13.05.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 8



months and 22 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having inflicted the injuries to the brother of complainant. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and the petitioner being on bail in other cases.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 22 days; on bail in other cases; charges were framed on 24.12.2025; complainant stands examined and 10 more prosecution witnesses still remain to be examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/heavy surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial



Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No