

2025:PHHC:081918



234

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

**CRM-M-34019-2025
DECIDED ON: 09.07.2025**

SATISH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.118 dated 07.03.2025, under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 340, 351(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station City Sirsa, District Sirsa.

2. Contentions:

On behalf of the petitioner

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled through a compromise dated 06.06.2025 (Annexure P-3), arrived at with the intervention of respected members of the society. It is further submitted that a petition for quashing of the FIR, based

on the said compromise, has been filed, in which notice of motion has been issued for 31.07.2025. The parties have also been directed to appear before the trial Court for recording of their statements in relation to the compromise.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner is behind bars for 4 months.

Learned State Counsel does not controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. **Analysis**

Considering the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise and filed a petition for quashing of the FIR on the basis of said compromise added with the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented on 07.05.2025 and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner, therefore, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for uncertain period, wherein “*bail is a rule and jail is an exception*” and it would also violate the principle of right to speedy trial and expeditious disposal under Article 21 of Constitution of India, as has been time and again discussed by this Court, while relying upon the judgment of the Apex Court passed in *Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131*.

4. **Relief:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.07.2025

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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