



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

216

CRM-M-55846-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 11.12.2025

Sachit ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Dr. Jaiveer Singh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.191 dated 18.10.2024 registered under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 110, 115(2) 333, 351(2), 117(2), 238(C) of BNS, at Police Station Jhojhu Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is in custody since 27.04.2025 and is not involved in any other case. Investigation of the case has already been completed and charges have been framed. The material witnesses have already been examined in this case. It is submitted that a compromise has been effected between the parties and a petition for quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise is pending before this Court for 22.12.2025. Thus, he prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and submits that in the present case, 6 accused persons have been arrested, however, 2 accused are yet to be arrested. Out of total 25 PWs, 11 PWs have been examined till date.



CRM-M-55846-2025 (O&M) (2)

5. Mr. Varun Veer Chauhan, Advocate for Mr. Mahesh Saxena, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed power of attorney, which is taken on record. Learned counsel for the complainant has admitted the factum of compromise and has filed an affidavit in this regard. Same is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties; the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 27.04.2025; material witnesses have been examined by the prosecution; he is not involved in any other case except the present one; a compromise has been effected between petitioner and complainant, trial will take sufficient time to conclude as only 11 PWs out of 25 PWs have been examined so far; and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the condition that his presence can be secured during trial.

11.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No