



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

213

CRM-M No.27524 of 2025 (O&M)

Reserved on :12.08.2025

Pronounced on: 13.08.2025

Sahil

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Mayank Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. By virtue of this petition regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No.232 dated 15.06.2023, Police Station Meham, District Rohtak, has been sought.

2. The petitioner, who is being prosecuted for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 308, 323, 341 and 506 IPC (Sections 147, 148 and 149 of IPC deleted and Section 34 and 325 IPC added later on), is seeking the benefit of bail. His application for bail has been dismissed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Rohtak, vide order dated 28.03.2025.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that FIR of this case came into being on a written complaint submitted by the complainant/injured Ravi. In his complaint, addressed to SHO Police Station Meham, it was informed by the above named complainant that on 14.06.2023 at about



5.30 P.M. when he along with his nephew Kunal was on his way to his house on a motorcycle, several persons namely Subhash & Sahil, armed with swords, Nikhin, Pawan & Vikram, carrying sticks, and Rishipal, armed with gandasa, blocked the passage and intercepted them. According to the complainant, thereafter, they launched an attack upon them and as a result of that, he (Ravi) and his nephew (Kunal) they suffered injuries. As per prosecution both the injured were examined medico-legally and at the time of Medico Legal examination it was recorded that two injuries caused by blunt weapon were found on the person of Ravi. In view of above mentioned compliant, formal FIR of this case was lodged.

4. Heard.

5. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered sufficient incarceration for being in custody for a period of 2 years and 20 days, and that investigation in this case is already complete and nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of the accused. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future and that detaining of petitioner is not likely to serve any purpose. On the abovementioned grounds the learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite specific categorical and serious in nature. He submits that a specific role has been attributed to the



petitioner and that a grievous injury has been inflicted by the petitioner on the head of Ravi, which is a vital part of the body. As per learned State counsel in view of abovementioned factors and the prominent role attributed to the petitioner, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. In the present case, for the decision of present bail application, following are the relevant factors which need consideration before arriving at any conclusion: -

(1). that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of 2 years and that the maximum punishment prescribed for the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner is imprisonment up to 7 years;

(2). that investigation in the present case is already complete and nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of accused;

(3). that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;

(4). that detaining of the petitioner in the judicial lock up is not likely to serve any purpose;

(5). that the petition for bail was not decided on merits.

8. If the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, the petitioner is deserves the benefit of bail.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court. In case, the concerned Court is not available, the learned Sessions Judge would be at liberty to assign the abovesaid



case, for the abovesaid purpose, to any other Court.

10. It is however made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

Pronounced on:13.08.2025

Manoj Bhutani

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