



227

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27334-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:23.05.2025

DEEPAK

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Ajay Kripal Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.241 dated 23.08.2024, registered under Sections 25 of Arms Act, 1959, and Sections 109(1), 115, 118(1), 190, 193(3), 324(4), 333 & 61 of BNS, 2023, Police Station Safidon, District Jind.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not initially named in the FIR nor there was any vague averment, which even remotely connected the petitioner with the commission of crime. Even his name surfaced in the supplementary statement made by Karampal, complainant, whereby the complainant had significantly improved his early version. Rather a cumulative reading of both the statements clearly show that the versions



cannot co-exist. He further contends that the injuries in the present case have been declared to be simple in nature. Moreover, he contends that it has been wrongly stated that the injuries were caused at the instance of the present petitioner. Moreover, his case is at par with Pankaj, co-accused, who has been granted the concession of bail of this Court vide order dated 24.04.2025 (Annexure P-4).

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that one more case has been ordered to be registered against him and the petitioner is clearly visible in the CCTV footage and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, no doubt serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, however, this Court is conscious of the fact that the petitioner continues to be in custody for the last about 08 months. Moreover, similarly placed co-accused, Pankaj has been admitted to bail vide order dated 24.04.2025 (Annexure P-4). Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

*(i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the*



*facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.*

*(ii) The petitioner shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.*

*(iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.*

*(iv) The petitioner shall surrender his passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case he is not holder of the same, he shall swear an affidavit to that effect.*

*(v) The petitioner shall also file his affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by him during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, he shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.*

*(vi) In case, the petitioner is involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.*

*(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner.*

*(viii) The petitioner shall report every 1<sup>st</sup> Monday in English calander month before the concerned SHO till the conclusion of the trial and SHO shall mark his presence by making an entry in the Rojnamcha. In case, he does not report on every 1<sup>st</sup> Monday before the concerned SHO, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in this regard.*

7. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him



shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

**23.05.2025**  
*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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