



CRM-M-51052-2025

-1-

141 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51052-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

Lokesh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.222 dated 15.06.2025, registered under Sections 115, 225, 351(3), 49, 117, 111(2)(b) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 308(4), 110, 3(5), 61(2) of BNS added lateron), at Police Station Rajendra Park, District Gurugram.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Sunil. It was alleged that the complainant used to take contract of pouring soil and he had taken contract of pouring soil for AIPL Company. Earlier Sunil @ Tota used to take contract for the company and on this he nurtured grudge with the complainant. On 14.06.2025, the complainant, Parvinder and Duvdutt were doing work at the site, then suddenly one Thar vehicle without number plate came, in which Manish Dahiya alongwith his fellow alighted from the vehicle armed with revolvers in their hands. They threatened them to be killed. Thereafter 4-5 other persons were also alighted having iron rod and batons in their hands. They exhorted to kill the complainant and all started beating him with batons and iron rod. They said that this work was to be done by Sunil @ Tota and Sandeep Tyagi only. The complainant fell

**CRM-M-51052-2025****-2-**

unconscious. Considering him as dead, they went from there. The complainant was admitted to Hospital for treatment. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and he was arrested on 17.06.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram for the grant of regular bail, however, after hearing both the sides, learned Court declined the same, vide order dated 06.09.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that neither the petitioner has been named in the FIR, nor there is any specific role attributed to him. However, he has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused Parveen and Manish. He submits that the petitioner was arrested on the disclosure statements of Parveen and Manish recorded on 17.06.2025 and on the very same day, he was arrested. He submits that the allegations against the petitioner are totally false and fabricated. He submits that the CCTV footage of the occurrence has not been produced by the Investigating Agency. He further contends that offence under Section 110 BNS, 2023 is not made out against the petitioner. He submits that in the challan presented, the petitioner has not been charge-sheeted for the offence under Section 110 of BNS. He, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the

**CRM-M-51052-2025****-3-**

submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner alongwith co-accused has committed heinous offence. It is contended that in all there are seven accused, however, out of them three accused still remain to be arrested. On instructions, he submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in two more cases. He submits that co-accused in the present case has a serious criminal history and the trial being at its initial stage granting bail to the petitioner would prejudice the trial. He, this, submits that no case for grant of bail is made out.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Sunil. The victim was beaten and he sustained grievous injuries. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner had faced prosecution in two other cases. Only challan has been presented. Out of total seven accused, three accused are yet to be arrested. Thus, this Court does not find any ground to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the case and the stage of the trial, this Court finds that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail at this stage. Thus, finding no merit in the present case, the same is hereby dismissed.

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

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**16.09.2025**

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

:

Yes/No