



CRA-S-1017-2026

-1-

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

212

CRA-S-1017-2026

Date of Decision: 12.05.2026

Lakshaydeep

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Narender Singh Gill, Advocate
for the appellant.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Present appeal is directed against the order dated 20.02.2026 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar dismissing the application of the appellant for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.26 dated 17.01.2025 registered under Sections 115, 117(2), 126, 296, 3(5) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 105 of BNS and Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, 1989 (hereinafter in short as 'SC/ST Act') added later on) (Section 126 of BNS deleted in final report), at Police Station Urban Estate, District Hisar.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the appellant along with other co-accused attacked complainant and his friend

**CRA-S-1017-2026****-2-**

Yash, because of which yash died later. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the present FIR is a counterblast to the ongoing matrimonial dispute between the appellant's sister and the complainant. He argued that the appellant has no relation with Yash and has never even seen him. He further submitted that the prosecution story is highly doubtful, as the alleged place of occurrence is stated to be Hisar Railway Station, which is a public place with heavy footfall, and no independent witness has been associated by the investigating agency, thereby raising serious doubts about the veracity of the prosecution version. He argued that, even if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, no specific injury has been attributed to the present appellant. He further submitted that the provisions of the SC/ST Act were added later only to make the offence graver. Moreover, the appellant has clean antecedents, as he is not involved in any other case. The appellant has been in custody since 04.06.2021. The investigation in the case is complete, the challan has been presented, and charges have also been framed. He further submitted that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the appellant behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the appeal deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel filed the custody certificate of the appellant, which was taken on record, and while referring to the status report already filed in the matter, opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the appellant are serious in nature. She argued that the appellant, along with the co-accused,

**CRA-S-1017-2026****-3-**

blocked the way of the complainant and Yash (deceased) and inflicted multiple repeated blows on them with an iron rod, as a result of which Yash died. She further submitted that the iron rod used by the appellant in the commission of the crime has been recovered from him. She further argued that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and that there is every apprehension that, if released on bail, the appellant might influence the witnesses. Hence, she prayed that the present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned state counsel and submits that the offence committed by the appellant is serious in nature and he has actively participated in the crime.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the material available on record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to the appellant. The allegations levelled against the appellant are grave and serious in nature, involving the commission of offences punishable under the IPC as well as the provisions of the SC/ST Act. As per the prosecution case, the appellant, along with the co-accused, wrongfully restrained the complainant and deceased Yash and inflicted repeated blows with an iron rod, resulting in the death of Yash. The specific role attributed to the appellant cannot be brushed aside at this stage, particularly when the weapon of offence allegedly used in the occurrence has been recovered from his possession. Furthermore, the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and as per learned state counsel, there exists a reasonable apprehension that, in the event of release on bail, the appellant may influence or intimidate the witnesses, thereby affecting the



CRA-S-1017-2026

-4-

fair conduct of the trial. The present appeal has been filed by the appellant seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra*, (2007) 1 SCC 242 and *State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi*, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC).

7. Considering the seriousness of the allegations, the manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, and without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice either party during trial, this Court does not find any ground to extend the benefit of bail to the appellant.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal being bereft of any merit, is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

12.05.2026

D.Bansal

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