



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

230

CRM-M-20190-2026

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

NXXXX (MINOR)

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... RESPONDENT


CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (439 of Cr.P.C), in FIR No. 271 dated 01.06.2025 registered under Sections 103(2) BNS (Section 302 IPC), Section 115 BNS (Section 323 IPC), Section 190 BNS (Section 149 IPC), Section 191(3) BNS (Section 148 IPC), Section 238(b) BNS (Section 201 IPC) and 351(3) BNS (Section 506 IPC) registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University, District Kurukshetra.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with his co-accused have caused death of Ram Rattan and gave injuries to the complainant as well. As per the case of the prosecution, accused Mohit had hit Ram Rattan on the backside of his head with an iron rod, which proved to be fatal and thereby caused his death. Besides, the other accused persons namely Mohit, Sahil, Balraj, Aaryan and Vikram @ Vicky, Ram Kumar also assaulted Purna Singh and his family members with bricks and stones. Purna Singh had sustained injuries on his left arm and chest.




3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a juvenile of 17 years of age. He further submits that the petitioner has been attributed only a simple injury i.e. a fist blow to the deceased Ram Rattan, however, none of the fatal injuries, which caused death of Ram Rattan, has been attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that the fatal injuries have been attributed to the co-accused Mohit, who had allegedly given injuries on the backside of head of the deceased with an iron rod. It is further stated that the petitioner (CCL) is in Observation Home for the last more than 10 months and 09 days and inquiry against him is yet to commence and as such, the same will take a long time to conclude. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. The affidavit filed by the Superintendent, Place of Safety, Madhuban, Karnal has been placed on record by the learned State Counsel, which shows that the petitioner is in Observation Home for the last more than 10 months and 09 days.

6. Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate appears and has filed his memo of appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 in the Court today and the same is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer made by ld. counsel for



CRM-M-20190-2026

-3-

the petitioner on the ground that the offence committed by the petitioner is heinous and grievous in nature.

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

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in Observation Home for the last more than 10 months and 09 days coupled with the fact that the inquiry against the petitioner (CCL) will take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

21.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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