

2025:PHHC:103146



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

**CRM-M No.23547 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 11.08.2025  
Reserved on: 05.08.2025**

Satish Kumar @ Kariya

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Amarsh Dudeja, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J.**

1. The instant one is the second petition for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.299 dated 28.11.2020 registered under Sections 302, 307, 148 and 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sector-14, Panchkula, District Panchkula. The first petition as filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M No.36721 of 2024 had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 06.08.2024.

2. As per the allegations, on 28.11.2020, an intimation was received regarding an incident having taken place in Rajiv Colony area. The police party had reached there and it was informed that the injured

2025:PHHC:103146



had been sent to General Hospital, Panchkula. On reaching there, the complainant Shiv Shankar had met the police party and recorded a statement to the effect that he was present at his house on the same day when he received information that his brother Ravi Shankar had been stabbed by someone and was lying in injured condition in the lane of Rajiv Colony. His brother had succumbed to the injuries. A knife had been stuck in the back of the victim. The complainant disclosed that he had made inquiries and had come to know that accused Sudhir had enmity with injured Deepak who was friend of victim Ravi Shankar and in an altercation, had caused injuries to both of them and Deepak was lying admitted in Government Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh. On the basis of this statement, a case under Sections 307 and 302 of IPC was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination and inquest proceedings of the dead body of victim Ravi Shankar were also conducted.

3. As per the further allegations, the statement of injured Deepak was recorded by the police on 17.12.2020 and he disclosed that on the fateful day, firstly, the accused Sunil, Sudhir, Urmila and the petitioner had assaulted him and Sudhir had struck blows with knife on his person. His friend Ravi Shankar had rushed for his rescue and then accused Sunil and Sudhir caught hold of him whereas the petitioner had struck several blows with a knife. On the basis of his statement, the petitioner and the co-accused Urmila, Sunil and Sudhir were nominated as such. The petitioner was arrested on 16.02.2021. The co-accused were also arrested. Presently, the

2025:PHHC:103146



petitioner is facing trial along with the co-accused.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. Even co-accused Sudhir did not disclose about his involvement in the occurrence, in the disclosure statement recorded by him. He has been implicated on the basis of statement recorded by injured Deepak twenty days after the incident. Injured eye-witness Deepak has since been examined. His testimony suffers from several material inconsistencies and is not reliable and proves that the petitioner had no hand in opening murderous assault upon the victim Ravi Shankar and causing injuries to Deepak. It is submitted that the trial would take considerable time to conclude. Several other witnesses remain to be examined. He is in custody since long. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. His complicity in the crime has been established not only on the basis of testimony of injured eye-witness Deepak but from other circumstances as well. The trial is going at a proper pace and there is nothing to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Even otherwise long incarceration in such like cases is not a reason for releasing the petitioner on bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

2025:PHHC:103146



6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, he is firstly alleged to have assaulted Deepak and when he had raised alarm, the victim Ravi Shankar had come for his rescue and then co-accused Sudhir and Sunil had caught hold of the victim Ravi Shankar whereas the present petitioner had struck blows with knife in the abdomen, neck and other parts of his body. PW Deepak also disclosed that the petitioner along with the co-accused Sudhir and Sunil had dragged Ravi Shanker inside their house at that time. As per the allegations, the petitioner was the one who struck several blows with knife in the abdomen, neck and other parts of the body of the victim. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record a copy of cross-examination of PW-10 Deepak and has argued that he has not supported the prosecution version. However, a perusal of the same reveals that this witness has been recalled for cross-examination and at that time, he is shown to have made some different statement. Learned counsel has submitted that he has duly supported the prosecution case in his examination-in-chief. It is only on the basis of thorough assessment of the evidence produced during the trial by the trial Court that it can be determined as to what is the effect of testimony of PW Deepak and no conclusion can be drawn at this stage. The allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature and as per the same, it was the petitioner who had given stab wounds to the victim Ravi Shankar that resulted in his death. It is

2025:PHHC:103146



well settled law that extended/prolonged period of incarceration in heinous crimes like murder is not a ground for grant of bail. Keeping in view the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

11.08.2025  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |