

2025:PHHC:072644



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M-28425-2025

Date of decision: May 27, 2025

DHEERAJ @ DUDHIYA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhinna, AAG, Haryana.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.239 dated 24.10.2024 under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 351(2) and 110 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Rampura, District Rewari (Annexure P-1).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant FIR (Annexure P-1) on the allegations that he, along with the co-accused, assaulted the complainant and his relatives using sticks and iron rods. It is contended that a perusal of the FIR reveals that no specific role has been assigned to the petitioner in the alleged incident. While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR, it has been further submitted that the FIR was lodged after an unexplained delay of 24 hours from the time of alleged occurrence. This delay had been used to fabricate a false and exaggerated version, as per the learned counsel, and



therefore, casts serious doubt on the authenticity and veracity of the version brought forth by the complainant.

3. It has still further been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been in custody since 18.04.2025 and identically placed co-accused have already been extended the concession of anticipatory bail. In support, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexures P-3 and P-4, which are the orders granting bail to co-accused Sohil Kumar and Manjit. A prayer has, therefore, been made that since the petitioner is also at par with the above-mentioned two accused, the petitioner be extended a similar relief.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, has opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite and has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR, which stands reproduced hereinunder: -

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the limited role attributed to the petitioner nor has he, on instructions, disputed the custody period of the petitioner. It has also not been disputed, on instructions, that the petitioner is identically placed as co-accused Sohil Kumar and Manjit, who have since been extended the concession of bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

7. The petitioner has been in custody since 18.04.2025. The trial would take considerable time to conclude as charges are yet to be framed. The role attributed to the petitioner is limited to carrying an iron rod and



allegedly causing a simple injury. Significantly, co-accused Sohil Kumar and Manjit, who are identically placed as the petitioner, have already been extended the concession of bail.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner as the trial would take considerable time to conclude.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed, and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**May 27, 2025**  
*Jaspreet Kaur*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No*

*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*