



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

240

CRM-M-33286-2025

Date of decision: 25th July, 2025

Satyawan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Abhinav Kaushik, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 152 dated 21.05.2025 registered under Sections 115, 110, 351(3) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Rai Sonipat, District Sonipat.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Satish, alleging therein that on 19.05.2025, he along with his father Azad Singh, had gone to his agricultural land to see installation of a tubewell. The petitioner, his father Inderpal and brother Balram, who are having land abutting to their agricultural land, and which is part of joint land, were already present there. On seeing them, Inderpal father of the petitioner made an exhortation that they would kill the complainant, if he did not give up the share in his possession in the land by



saying that he had no share in the same. The complainant and his father refused to resist and then they opened an attack upon him. The petitioner struck a blow with a stick on the head of the complainant due to which, he had sustained injury and fallen down. Brother of the petitioner struck a blow with a sickle on the person of the complainant. His father also sustained injuries at their hand. On clamour being raised, the petitioner and co-accused fled while extending threats to them. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 24.05.2025. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and demarcated the place of occurrence besides getting a wooden stick recovered. The complainant recorded his supplementary statement. Three injuries sustained by the complainant were opined to be grievous in nature. The co-accused were also joined into investigation but were declared to be innocent. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been presented against the petitioner.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of two days in lodging of the FIR. The persons who were named as co-accused have found to be innocent and this fact falsify the veracity of the version in the FIR. The matter has even otherwise been settled between the parties. He is in custody since long. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has submitted that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of



bail. However, learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties who are near relatives and that he has no objection, if the petition is allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the complainant and his father on 19.05.2025. The matter was reported to the police after a gap of two days. Trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. No relevance can be given to the fact that the complainant has also submitted that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties, however, keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has clean antecedents and that the trial would take time, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

9. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

25th July, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*