



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

241

CRM-M No.65108 of 2024

Date of Decision:10.01.2025

Vikas

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate  
Ms. Khushboo Garg, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita in case FIR No.239 dated 24.10.2024 under Sections 110, 115, 190, 192(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita registered at Police Station Rampura, District Rewari.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner has been named in the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, however, a perusal of the same, leaves no manner of doubt that no role, much less, any injury has been attributed to him. He has also submitted that it is evidently a case of false implication, as there could have been no occasion for the petitioner, in the absence of any previous history of strained relations with the complainant party, to have accompanied the co-accused or have participated in any manner in the occurrence in question. It has still further been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that one of the co-accused, who had not only been named in the FIR in question but also attributed an injury with a stick on



the person of the complainant, has already been enlarged on anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.11.2024 (Annexure P-3). Therefore, in the aforesaid facts and circumstances, a prayer has been made to admit the petitioner to bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has reiterated the contents of the FIR, which stand reproduced herein under:-

*“To the SHO Sahib, Police Station Rampura Rewari. Sir I am Sachin S/o Azad Singh resident of village Gulabpura, District Rewari. Yesterday, on 23.10.2024 at around 10:15 PM, I and my uncle's son Rajesh S/o Mukesh and Vikrant S/o Karna Singh and Bhupendra S/o Roshanlal, residents of Gulabpura, the four of us were going from the temple to our homes after giving food to Baba Ji living in the temple of our village. At the same time, Yashpal S/o Shahjad and Dheeraj S/o Hawa Singh and Dharmendra S/o Hawas Singh resident of Gubalpura and with them Sohil S/o Ravindra and Vikas S/o Indrajeet and Manjeet resident of Dehlawas and 3-4 other boys came with sticks and iron rods in their hands and attacked all four of us, as soon as they arrived, Yashpal caught Rajesh from behind, Dheeraj, Dharmendra and Sohil hit us on the head and other parts with the sticks and iron rods in their hands and also hit me and my companions and while leaving they were saying that today we have let you all go, next time we will kill one or two of you. Legal action should be taken against the above boys who beat us without any reason.”*

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the fact that other than being named in the FIR in question, no role, much less, injury has been attributed to the petitioner and furthermore, at the relevant point of time, he was unarmed. It has also not been disputed that the co-accused, Sohil Kumar,



who has been attributed an injury with a stick has since been extended the concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 22.11.2024, which is annexed as Annexure P-3.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 22.11.2024. He has not been attributed any role, much less, injury on the complainant party in the occurrence in question. As not disputed by the learned State counsel on instructions, the petitioner was not carrying any arm, much less, lethal on the fateful day. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

January 10, 2025  
Pankaj\*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No