



232

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38759-2026
Date of Decision: 22.07.2026

AMAN ALIAS RAHUL

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Jagdeep S. Rana, Advocate,
Mr. Arvind K. Bangar, Advocate and
Mr. Arpit K. Bangar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Lokendra Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present first bail petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in FIR No.0076 dated 17.03.2026, registered under Sections 109(1), 115, 118(2), 296 and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 307, 323, 324, 294, 506 and 326 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860), at Police Station Urban Estate, Hisar, Haryana, during the pendency of trial.

2. The present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Keshav. As per the prosecution case, the complainant was working as a Supervisor in a private company engaged in municipal work, whereas the petitioner was employed as a Helper in the same establishment. It is alleged that on 17.03.2026, the petitioner contacted the complainant telephonically



regarding the release of his salary, pursuant to which an altercation took place between them. It is further alleged that later in the evening, the petitioner reached the workplace of the complainant and attacked him with a knife, causing injuries on his abdomen and chest. Thereafter, the complainant was shifted to Civil Hospital, Hisar. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the present FIR was registered against the petitioner under Sections 109(1), 115, 118(2), 296 and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 307, 323, 324, 294, 506 and 326 IPC).

2.1 During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 18.03.2026. The Investigating Agency recorded the statements of witnesses, collected the medical evidence and other relevant material, and allegedly recovered the weapon of offence from the petitioner. After completion of investigation, the final report/challan was presented before the learned Trial Court on 06.05.2026. It is further submitted by the prosecution that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he is alleged to have caused injuries to the complainant with a knife. The application for regular bail filed by the petitioner before the learned Sessions Court, Hisar, was dismissed vide order dated 04.06.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no connection with the alleged occurrence. It is argued that the petitioner is a young person aged about 22 years and has been in judicial custody since 18.03.2026.

3.1 Learned counsel further submits that the prosecution story is doubtful and does not inspire confidence. It is contended that the alleged occurrence arose out of a dispute between co-workers regarding payment of



salary and the allegations are exaggerated. It is submitted that although the complainant initially alleged that the petitioner caused injuries with a knife, he has subsequently executed an affidavit dated 03.07.2026 wherein he has stated that the petitioner was not the person who attacked him and that the injuries were caused by an unknown person.

3.2 It is further argued that the investigation has already been completed, the challan has been presented before the learned Trial Court, and no further custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. The evidence relied upon by the prosecution is already collected and is primarily medical, documentary and witness-based in nature. Therefore, continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

3.3 Learned counsel also submits that after dismissal of the earlier bail application by the learned Sessions Court, the parties have amicably resolved their dispute and entered into a compromise dated 03.07.2026. The complainant has no objection to the grant of bail and has expressed his willingness not to oppose the present petition. It is further submitted that no independent witness from the workplace has been cited by the prosecution to support the alleged occurrence. The entire case rests upon the statement of the complainant, which has subsequently been diluted by his affidavit. It is contended that the petitioner is not required for any further investigation and there is no possibility of his tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the State and opposes the grant of regular bail and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is



contended that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and is alleged to have caused knife injuries on the abdomen and chest of the complainant with the intention to cause death. Learned State counsel submits that the medical evidence collected during investigation supports the prosecution version and the weapon of offence has also allegedly been recovered from the petitioner. It is argued that the compromise or affidavit executed by the complainant cannot by itself absolve the petitioner of criminal liability, particularly when the offence alleged is serious and affects society at large. It is further submitted that the matter is at the stage of trial and the complainant and other witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, there remains a possibility of the petitioner influencing the witnesses or obstructing the course of justice.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions and perused the record.

7. This Court has considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has gone through the material available on record. The allegations against the petitioner are that he caused injuries to the complainant by using a knife pursuant to an altercation between the parties. The petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and serious allegations have been levelled against him for having caused injuries with a dangerous weapon. The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the compromise/affidavit executed by the complainant; however, this Court finds that the offences alleged against the petitioner are non-compoundable in nature. The criminal proceedings in respect of such offences cannot be brought to an end merely on the basis of a compromise between the parties, as the alleged acts are not merely private disputes but involve an element of



public wrong affecting the administration of criminal justice. The fact that the complainant has entered into a compromise or does not wish to pursue the matter cannot, at this stage, dilute the seriousness of the allegations or wipe out the criminal liability arising from the alleged occurrence. The allegations are required to be tested during the course of trial on the basis of evidence led by the prosecution and the defence.

8. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the occurrence is alleged to have taken place, the use of a sharp-edged weapon, and the fact that the offences invoked are non-compoundable, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

22.07.2026

kv

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