



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

209

CRM-M-15109-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.04.2026

Arun Khatri

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Bijender Dhankhar, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.436 dated 15.11.2024, registered under Sections 140(3), 308(7), 61 BNS (Sections 7-A, 13(1)(B), 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act added later on) (Corresponding to Sections 363A, 382, 120 IPC) at Police Station Sector-27, District Sonipat.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for more than a year. There is an unexplained delay of 25 days in lodging the FIR. It is a case of no demand and acceptance of money by him. Material witnesses namely Satbir-complainant and his son-Bhushan have been examined on 16.02.2026 and did not support the case of the prosecution qua the petitioner. There are 22 more witnesses, who remain to be examined, though the charges have been framed on 12.11.2025. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

3. The custody certificate dated 07.04.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 1



year and 7 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner levelled in the complaint and he was seen in the CCTV footage, during the alleged incident. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 7 days; not involved in any other case; charges were framed on 12.11.2025; complainant and his son stand examined, however, 22 more prosecution witnesses still remain to be examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted



with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.

- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
M.Kamra

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