

CRM-M-27435-2025
CRM-M-5832-2025
CRM-M-30321-2025

1

2025:PHHC:140763



227 (03 cases)

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

1. CRM-M-27435-2025

SatnamPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

2. CRM-M-5832-2025

Pardeep @ Minia @ MeenuPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

3. CRM-M-30321-2025

Sandeep @ BoxerPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

Date of decision :13.10.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-27435-2025.

Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-5832-2025.

Mr. Sankalp Gehlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-30321-2025.

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

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)



1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid three petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.505 dated 22.08.2023, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 307 of IPC and Section 42 of Prison Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, District Hisar.

3. As per the facts of the case, the parties of both the sides are the prisoners and the occurrence had taken place inside the jail. The FIR has been lodged on the statement of a prisoner, namely, Sandeep @ Bangru. It was alleged that on 21.08.2023 at about 7:00 PM when he was in his barrack then Sandeep (petitioner in CRM-M-30321-2025) S/o Kala Ram, Satnam (petitioner in CRM-M-27435-2025) S/o Madan Lal, Saga S/o Hanuman, Parveen S/o Hansraj, Sachin S/o Lilu Ram, Sandeep S/o Surender, Sushil S/o Aatma Ram, Pardeep (petitioner in CRM-M-5832-2025) S/o Kapil Dev and Sandeep S/o Prem opened attack upon him. They caught hold of him and started hitting him with one sharp object. On raising alarm his friends Jai Bhagwan, Sahil, Parveen, Parmod etc. rescued him. He was admitted in the hospital for treatment and was referred to MAMC Agroha. The request was made to take legal action against the culprits. As a cross case to the incident, another FIR i.e. FIR No.504 dated 22.08.2023 was registered by petitioner-Satnam. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioners were arrested on 22.08.2023, 21.08.2023 and 21.04.2024, respectively. They approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar declined the bail applications vide orders



dated 11.03.2025, 02.01.2025 and 01.05.2025, respectively. Aggrieved by the same, petitioners are before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that admittedly the occurrence had taken place inside the jail premises as both the parties are prisoners who were facing prosecution in other FIRs. It is submitted that the ocular version is not medically corroborated as whether the injury was dangerous to life or not, is doubtful. It is submitted that the doctors have opined that the injuries might be dangerous to life. They further submit that once the cases are of version and cross version, it would be on the conclusion of the trial when it would be assessed, which party was the aggressor. They submit that the petitioners are on bail the cases in which they were originally lodged. It is submitted that they are behind bars from last more than 02 years, however, only complainant has been examined till date. They, thus, submit that in the facts and circumstances the petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

5. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Sunil Kumar, H.P.S., Deputy Superintendent of Police, Women Safety, Hisar (in CRM-M-5832-2025) has been filed on behalf of respondent-State, in the Court today, same is taken on record.

6. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that the petitioners are habitual offenders. He submits that the injured was medically examined and as per the opinion of the doctor, the injuries suffered were dangerous to life. He, on instructions, submits that



out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined. He has produced the custody certificates of the petitioners, in the Court today. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report filed and submits that no case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, is made out.

7. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case in hand is of version and cross-version. The incident had taken place inside the jail premises. Both the sides are emphasizing the other to be aggressor. Admittedly, the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest. As per custody certificates petitioners, namely, Satnam and Sandeep @ Boxer have suffered an incarceration of about 02 years and petitioner-Pardeep @ Minia @ Meenu has suffered an incarceration of 02 years, 01 month and 01 day, as on 13.10.2025. It further reflects that petitioners are involved in other cases as well. Learned counsel for the petitioners have also submitted before this Court that the complainant himself is facing prosecution in 20 other cases. The prosecution has examined the complainant only till date and out of 25 prosecution witnesses only 01 witness has been examined.

8. 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be



released on bail on their 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.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioners during the period of 07 days from today, then their further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

13.10.2025

ps-I

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