



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

256

CRM-M No.321 of 2026

Date of decision : 15.1.2026

Date of uploading : 16.1.2026

Karan Soran @ Karan Sheoran

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Gahlian, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Addl. AG, Punjab

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.293 dated 14.6.2025 under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 331(6), 109, 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the father's name of the petitioner is actually 'Balraj Singh and it has been wrongly recorded in the Sessions Court's order as 'Madan Lal'. Learned counsel has submitted that instant bail petition and order passed by the Sessions Court be read in respect of Karan Soran @ Karan Sheoran



son of Balraj Singh.

Ordered accordingly.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused on 13.6.2025 armed with gandasis, dattars and pistols has forcibly entered the flat of the complainant and caused injuries to the complainant and his friends after a verbal brawal with Karan Soran on telephone in the morning.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 22.8.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question as the injured had received injury on account of an accident whereinafter the petitioner was implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the said misunderstanding has since been resolved and a compromise dated 18.12.2025 has been entered into between the parties. Learned counsel has further relied upon the affidavits of injured/FIR-complainant (copy whereof have been appended as Annexure P-3 alongwith the instant petition). Learned counsel has further submitted that investigation qua the FIR in question is complete and culmination of trial will take long. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 15.1.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.



4.1 At this juncture, Ms. Prabhnoor Kaur Bains, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of the FIR-complainant-injured namely; Hemant Dahiya, Tushar and Ankit and has filed her *Vakalatnama* on their behalf. She has ratified the aspect of matter having been settled between the parties.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 22.8.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 13.11.2025. Total 17 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. The rival contention, including the weightage/veracity required to be attached to the compromise dated 18.12.2025 (copy whereof has been appended as Annexure P-2) and affidavits dated 15/18.12.2025 (copies whereof have been appended as Annexure P-3 with the instant petition); shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 Indubitably, the present petition is the 2nd attempt by the petitioner to secure regular bail. The last bail plea preferred by the petitioner was dismissed on 2.12.2025 with better particulars. Instant petition has been filed alongwith copy of compromise dated 18.5.2025



and affidavits dated 15/18.12.2025. However, keeping in view the extended incarceration of the petitioner and the filing of the compromise/affidavits is sufficient cause in the considered opinion of this Court to affirmatively consider the instant plea for bail. A profitable reference, in this regard, can be made to a judgment of this Court passed in **CRA-S-2332-2023** titled as **Rafiq Khan versus State of Haryana and another**; relevant whereof reads as under:

“10. As an epilogue to the above discussion, the following principles emerge:

I. Second/successive regular bail petition(s) filed is maintainable in law & hence such petition ought not to be rejected solely on the ground of maintainability thereof.

II. Such second/successive regular bail petition(s) is maintainable whether earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or earlier petition was dismissed on merits.

III. For the second/successive regular bail petition(s) to succeed, the petitioner/applicant shall be essentially/pertinently required to show substantial change in circumstances and showing of a mere superficial or ostensible change would not suffice. The metaphoric expression of seeking second/successive bail plea(s) ought not be abstracted into literal iterations of petition(s) without substantial, effective and consequential change in circumstances.

IV. No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute substantial change in circumstances as every case has its own unique facts/circumstance. Making such an attempt is nothing but an utopian endeavour. Ergo, this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such second/successive regular bail petition(s).

V. In case a Court chooses to grant second/successive regular bail petition(s), cogent and lucid reasons are pertinently required to be recorded for granting such plea despite such a plea being second/successive petition(s). In other words, the cause for a Court having successfully countenanced/entertained such second/successive petition(s) ought to be readily and clearly decipherable from the said order passed.”

6.2 As per custody certificate dated 15.1.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 4



months and 24 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in one more FIR. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or



- documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
 - (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
 - (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
 - (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
 - (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

15.1.2026
Ashwanii

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