



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

223

**CRM-M-58946-2024
Date of Decision: 18.08.2025**

PRINCE CHAUHAN

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Yashveer Kharb, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No. 731 dated 30.12.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 302 and 452 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 212 and 459 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act were added later on and Section 452 IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Sector 32-33 Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that complainant's son, Sonu, was sitting at his shop when a group of 10 to 15 boys were fighting and throwing stones at one another. The petitioner went outside the shop in an attempt to intervene, but subsequently returned inside. Following this, all the boys came to his son and started fighting with him. One of them stabbed his son and gave blows with a knife, after which they dragged his son into the street and continued to assault him.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR. The petitioner has been nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Amit Jhinjania. He further submits that there is only disclosure statement against the petitioner and the same is inadmissible and is not a piece of evidence. The petitioner is in custody since 05.01.2024.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 07 months. On asking, he submits that there is only disclosure statement of the co-accused against the petitioner and no other evidence has come on record. He further submits that out of 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined.

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

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and that there is no other evidence collected against the petitioner except the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused; none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far; since the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on



regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

18.08.2025

renu

**(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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