



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

219

**CRA-S-1349-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 13.10.2025**

**Aman Kumar**

**... Appellant**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana and another**

**... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present:- Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate  
for the appellant.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Lallar, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The appellant has approached this Court by way of present appeal under Section 14-A of SC/ST Act, 1989 praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.356 dated 10.10.2021, under Sections 302, 307, 201, 34 of IPC and Section 3(1) (s) 3(2)(V) SC/ST Act, registered at Police Station City Butana, District Karnal.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely Mahender Singh. It was alleged that on 08.10.2021 during the wedding of his daughter Kirti, they were standing in the street after the celebration. In the meantime, Aman (appellant) came



there driving his Endeavor car bearing Registration No. HR 26AK 4356, he shouted at them that why they were blocking the way. He not only abused them but also used casteist slurs. The same was brought to the notice of his family members but his father Balvinder also threatened them. The appellant rammed his car into the family of the complainant. As a result, his sister-in-law Rajrani, brother Subhash, his wife Baby and nephew Rajneesh suffered multiple injuries. They were shifted to the hospital. However, Rajrani and his brother Subhash succumbed to their injuries.

3. There occurred two deaths and four persons suffered serious injuries. Request was made to take the legal action. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the accused was arrested on 17.11.2021. He approached the learned Court of Addl. Sessions Judge, Karnal praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing the parties and finding no merit, the learned Addl. Sessions Judge declined the same vide order dated 25.03.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the same, the appellant has approached this Court by filing the present appeal praying for grant of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant has vehemently contended that the appellant was 19 years of age at the time of the alleged occurrence. It has been submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, there cannot be said to have any intention on the part of the appellant, as the deaths have taken place due to the accident met with the vehicle in question. He submits that the appellant and the complainant's family are from the same village. However, after the unfortunate accident, the same has been given a colour of castiest words. It is further submitted that appellant is



behind bars from the date of his arrest and all the material witnesses, including the injured witnesses, already stands examined. He submits that the appellant has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other criminal case till now. He submits that the appellant has virtually completed incarceration of four years. There is no likelihood of the trial to be concluded in near future and hence, the appellant deserves to be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the appellant. It is submitted that the complainant family lost its two family members and four persons were seriously injured. He further submits that the appellant had the intention and his knowledge is writ large from his conduct. He, thus, submits that no case for grant of bail is made out.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent-State, on instructions from HC Ravinder Kumar, has opposed the bail to the appellant by submitting that offence involved two deaths and four injured. The conduct of the appellant do not entitle him for grant of bail. He further submits that co-accused i.e. father of the appellant is yet to be arrested as the family is absconding. He, on instructions, submits that out of 39 witnesses, 15 witnesses, including the injured, have been examined.

7. Learned State counsel has also placed on record the custody certificate which shows that the appellant has undergone actual sentence of 03 years 11 months and 13 days and no other case is pending against him.



8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case.

9. It is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case had taken place on 08.10.2021. The occurrence took place due to the alleged driving of the Endeavor car by the appellant. The complainant party and the appellant are of the same village. It is an admitted fact the appellant was 19 years of age at the time of occurrence. The custody certificate produced before the Court would show that the appellant has undergone actual sentence of 03 years 11 months and 13 days and no other case is pending against him. As submitted before this Court, all the material witnesses have already been examined. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the appellant has the right of speedy trial.

10. 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.

11. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695*** has held as under:

*“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”*



12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in '*Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024*', has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

13. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the appellant succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the appellant. Accordingly, present appeal is allowed and appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

14. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.10.2025

Satyawan

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned*

*Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*