



230

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

CRA-S-550-2025

Date of Decision:14.05.2025

SANJU

...APPELLANT

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

...RESPONDENTS

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

Present :- Mr. Rao Ajender Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal against the impugned order dated 02.01.2025 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Rewari, in case FIR No.368 dated 12.10.2024, under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 3(5), 27, 109(1), 238(c) & 110 of BNS, Section 25 of Arms Act & Section 3(1)S of Schedule Caste/Schedule Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, registered at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari, whereby the application for grant of regular bail, filed by the appellant was ordered to be dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant/respondent No.2 in the present case, the appellant had allegedly inflicted injuries with a knife on the back of Anand,



injured/complainant. He further submits that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital and is hale and hearty. He further contends that even the medical record in the present case has been manipulated by the police in collusion with the complainant. He next contends that the appellant was arrested in the present case on 06.11.2024 and is in custody for the last more than 06 months and the final report under Section 193 of BNSS has been presented before the competent Court on 22.11.2024. He further submits that he had concealed the material facts and rather the appellant had also suffered serious injuries on his person, which is evident from the MLR (Annexure P-5). He further contends that the police had registered two cases earlier against the appellant, however, the appellant is on bail in the said cases.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant on the ground that the serious allegations have been levelled against the present appellant and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He submits that the appellant is involved in two more cases. He further submits that respondent No.2 was informed by SHO, Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari, with regard to the pendency of the present case before this Court, however, despite service neither he has appeared in person nor his representative by any learned counsel.

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

5. In the present case, the appellant himself had suffered injuries, which is established from his MLR (Annexure P-5). Even Anand, injured had suffered injuries on his person but he has already been discharged from the



hospital in the present case. Moreover, the final report of investigation in the present case has been presented before the competent Court and the complainant has been examined in the present case. Thus, there are no chances of tampering with the material evidence in the present case.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

14.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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