



132-1

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

CRM-M-5952-2026

Date of decision: 18.03.2026

VISHAL ALIAS VICKY SODHI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sankalp Dhanda, Advocate
Mr. Japsehaj Singh, Advocate
Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Balraj Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J (Oral):

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.331 dated 03.07.2025 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 111(4), 190, 191(3), 331(6), 351(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Snahita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as BNS) at Police Station Krishna Gate, Thanesar, District Kurukshetra, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant made complaint against the petitioner and 20/25 unknown persons stating therein that the accused had come to the house of the complainant and enquired about his son Prashant and thereafter threatened that his son would be done to death. The accused then left the spot while brandishing their weapons

like *gandasi, dandas, iron rods etc.*




3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner was in Ujjain at the time of alleged occurrence. The petitioner has undergone 8 months and 02 days of custody. Learned counsel hence prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. She further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 02 days.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, it has transpired that there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of crime; he is in custody for the last 08 months and 02 days; the trial is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, 'bail is rule and jail is exception'.

7. 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 bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



8. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026
monika

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes /No