

HRRE010058722026



Presented on : 30-07-2026
Registered on : 30-07-2026
Decided on : 03-08-2026
Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 4 days

**IN THE COURT OF
Additional District and Sessions Judge
AT ,Rewari
(Presided Over by Vikas Gupta)
BA/929/2026**

Lal Chand Maurya S/o Ghirau Maurya R/o village Pratappur PO Maharajganj,
District Azamgarh, UP (266137).

...Applicant/Accused.

Versus

State of Haryana.

... Respondent.

FIR No. : 110 of 2026
Under Sections : 110,125,287,3(5), 105 BNS, Section 7A and
Rule 66-B, 102-B, SEH XXV of Punjab
Factory Rules, 1952, Section 45 of the
Factories Act, 1948 and Rule 70-O of the
Punjab Factory Rules, 1952.
Police Station : Bawal, Rewari.

Application for regular Bail Under B.N.S.S, 2023.

Present: Sh. Kapil Goswami, Advocate for applicant/accused.
Sh. Shashi Pal, Ld. Public Prosecutor for State.
SI Satya Narain, investigating officer in person.

ORDER:

By this order, this Court shall dispose of regular bail application
filed by the above-named applicant/accused in case bearing FIR No.110 of

(Vikas Gupta),
ASJ, Rewari 03.08.2026
UID No. HR-0224

Lal Chandra Maurya Vs. State of Haryana

-2-

2026, Under Sections 110,125,287,3(5), 105 BNS, Section 7A and Rule 66-B, 102-B, SEH XXV of Punjab Factory Rules, 1952, Section 45 of the Factories Act, 1948 and Rule 70-O of the Punjab Factory Rules, 1952, Police Station-Bawal, Rewari.

2. The case of the prosecution was launched on the complaint of Vikram Yadav S/o Ramotar Yadav to the effect that he has been working with GLS Pvt. Ltd company Sector-5, Plot no.20, Bawal as AGM for the last 10 months. On 19.05.2026 at around 11.00 AM, he was working on the production floor of the company, then suddenly, there was an explosion in the reactor installed on the floor and a fire broke out, at that time, around 50-60 people were working on the production floor and in their company, ink and resin chemical are manufactured and many times, small incidents used to happen on the production floor of the company, about which they had informed the company officials and owner many times and they have many times asked the HR head or other officials in the company to enlarge the emergency gate of the company and to provide ambulances in the company, but the company owner or officials deliberately did not pay attention to the above request. It has further been averred that on that day, after the incident, when the employees working at floor started running away, he and 5-6 employees got burnt in this fire. If the company's EMERGENCY gate was more wide, then they would have gone from there. It has further been averred that thereafter, his colleagues took him to Jain Hospital Bawal in their private vehicle and other burnt employees were also taken to different hospitals by the

Lal Chandra Maurya Vs. State of Haryana

-3-

other employees in their private vehicles. This accident has happened because the company owner, HR HEAD or other officials ignored the accidents that happened in the company in the past due to which the employees working in the company got burnt. With these allegations, formal FIR was registered and the applicant-accused was arrested.

3. The applicant-accused has moved the bail application with the averments that applicant-accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case, and the prosecution has attempted to fasten criminal liability upon him merely because he was working as an AGM in the company. It has further been averred that applicant neither owned nor controlled the establishment and was not the occupier or the person responsible under the provisions of the Factories Act for installation or maintenance of fire safety system or implementation of statutory safety measures. It has further been averred that the unfortunate occurrence was purely an industrial accident and the exact cause of which is a matter of investigation. It has further been averred that prosecution case is founded upon documentary evidence, including inspection reports prepared by the labour department, industrial safety & Health department etc. which were already in the possession of the investigating agency. Therefore, no purpose would be served by keeping the applicant-accused in further custody. It has further been averred that applicant-accused was arrested on 14.07.2026 and no recovery is to be effected from the applicant-accused. It has further been averred that applicant has no previous criminal antecedents and has never been involved in

Lal Chandra Maurya Vs. State of Haryana

-4-

any criminal case. It has further been averred that applicant shall abide all the terms and conditions imposed upon him. Hence, he prayed that the present bail application may be allowed.

4. Upon notice, reply to the bail application was filed by the police through Ld. Public Prosecutor for the State on usual grounds.

5. I have heard the Learned Counsel for the applicant- accused as well as Ld. Public Prosecutor for the State.

6. Ld. Counsel for the applicant-accused argued that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further argued that the applicant-accused is just an employee and has no connection with the alleged offence. He further argued that no recovery is to be effected from the possession of applicant-accused and that a compromise has been effected with the complainant Vikram Yadav and he has also furnished an affidavit dated 10.07.2026 mentioning therein that he has not given any statement to the police resulting in to the registration of the FIR in question (copy of affidavit placed on record). He further argued that applicant-accused is not found involved in any other case. Therefore, he prayed that the present bail application may be allowed.

7. On the other hand, Ld. APP for the state argued that death of two employees i.e. Ram Babu and Pravesh took place. He further argued that arrest

of co-accused is pending. He even argued that further investigation is pending. Therefore, he prayed that the bail application may kindly be dismissed.

8. After hearing the Learned Counsel for the applicant-accused as well as Ld. Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State, I am of the considered opinion that:-

Admittedly, as per prosecution case, FIR No.110/2026 P.S Bawal, Rewari has been got registered upon the complaint of Vikram Yadav. Moreover, the applicant-accused has made himself ***disclosure statement*** about the present case in which there is clear mention that the applicant-accused is ***responsible*** for the supervision of fire and safety in the company in question. Furthermore, demarcation of place of occurrence has also been got conducted by the applicant-accused. Moreover, as per the investigating officer present in the court, ***death*** of co-employees Hari Babu and Pravesh took place. Whereas complainant Vikram Yadav was badly burnt. Moreover, arrest of co-accused persons namely Arjun Singh, Vijayvir and Neel Kamal is ***still pending***. Moreover, ***further investigation*** is ***pending***. Therefore in these circumstances, merely because the applicant-accused is in custody since 14.07.2026, does not entitled him benefit of bail specifically when the further investigation is still pending.

9. Moreover, so far as the affidavit of the complainant Vikram Yadav is concerned, as per the investigating officer present in the court, the complainant Vikram Yadav has also badly got burnt in the alleged incident.

Lal Chandra Maurya Vs. State of Haryana

-6-

10. Hence, if the applicant-accused is released on bail, he may try to influence the witnesses and may flee from justice. Thus, it will not be in the interest of justice to release the applicant-accused on bail.

11. For the foregoing discussion, the application under Section 483 of BNSS moved by the applicant-accused for regular bail, is hereby **dismissed**.

11. File be consigned to record room, after due compliance.

Announced in open Court.
Dated:03.08.2026.

(Vikas Gupta)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Rewari.

Note: This Order contains 6 pages and each page is dictated, checked and signed by me.

(parveen)

(Vikas Gupta)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Rewari, UID No. HR-0224

Lal Chandra Maurya Vs. State of Haryana

-7-

Present: Sh. Kapil Goswami, Advocate for applicant/accused.
Sh. Shashi Pal, Ld. Public Prosecutor for State.
SI Satya Narain, investigating officer in person.

Reply to the bail application filed. Arguments on the bail application heard. Order pronounced. Vide my separate detailed order of even date, the application for bail of the applicant/accused has been *dismissed*. File be consigned to record room.

Pronounced in open Court

parveen

(Vikas Gupta),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Rewari/03.08.2026
UID No. HR-0224