



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M No.17226 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Sandeep Yadav @ Sulli

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Jeevanjot S. Kang, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.426 dated 18.12.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109(1), 111(2)(b), 117(2), 190, 191(3) & 324(4) [Sections 61(2) and 309(6) were added later on] of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Narender Yadav', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 17.12.2025, at about 06:30 PM, he received an information with regard to an altercation involving his cousin 'Vikrant @



Vicky'. As per complainant, when he reached the spot, he found that assailants, namely 'Babbu Khaira', 'Vashu Potting' and 'Mahesh Bachod' accompanied with 14-15 other persons were brutally assaulting 'Vikrant' with iron rods and sticks. The complainant further stated that, as a result of abovesaid assault, 'Vikrant' suffered multiple injuries and was profusely bleeding. On arrival of villagers the assailants fled from the spot.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. It is the case of the prosecution that 'Mahesh @ Mahesha' was arrested and during the course of interrogation he revealed the name of 'Sachin @ Sucha', 'Sandeep Yadav @ Sulli' (the petitioner herein) and 'Ajay @ Shera' and other persons in his disclosure statement. According to prosecution a Bolero vehicle used in the commission of offence was recovered from the fields, which is stated to be registered in the name of petitioner's father.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. Status report on behalf of State has already been filed.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned Senior counsel for the for the petitioner that the name of the petitioner does not figure in the FIR, and that as per the final report submitted by the police before the learned trial Court the only allegation against the petitioner is that at the time of incident he was present on the spot and with the help of stone he smashed the window of the car, and also inflicted injury on the person of complainant with kicks. It has



also been contended by learned Senior counsel for the petitioner that name of the petitioner has cropped-up in the disclosure statement of co-accused and there is no corroborative evidence.

7. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above mentioned arguments. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the complainant that in the present case there are very serious allegations against the petitioner with regard to involvement of the petitioner in the heinous offence. According to learned counsel for the complainant the medical opinion shows that, but for proper treatment the injury suffered by the complainant could have been fatal. It has also been contended that for a very long period the petitioner was undergoing treatment and hospitalized.

8. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the complainant has also contended that in the present case in addition to Section 109(1), Section 111(2)(b), too, has been invoked, which shows that the petitioner is part of the group which is involved in illegal activities and the same has been explained by the victim in his statement.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of the record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision in the present petition:-

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of four months and twenty two days;
- ii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- iii) that the injury which is supposed to be fatal has not been



attributed to the petitioner;

- iv) that the only evidence collected by the Investigating Agency, against the petitioner is the disclosure statement of his co-accused, which was recorded when the co-accused was already in police custody. Thus, there is a question mark with regard to admissibility of above mentioned disclosure statement in evidence;;
- v) that the trial is at initial stage. Thus, it is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that the investigation in this case is already complete and, therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vii) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- iX) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in trial.

11. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another', (2018) 3 SCC 22, are relevant, wherein it has been observed that "a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is



that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case”.

12. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation’ (2022) 10 SCC 51 are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice”.

13. Recently, in the case of ‘Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of



Chhattisgarh', 2025 SCC Online SC 322, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed that "if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then, definitely, it could be said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed". It has also been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that "delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently".

14. To elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to an undertrial prisoner, as mandated by Hon'ble Apex court in 'Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another' 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

15. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

16. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. However, the abovesaid benefit shall be subject to following conditions:-



- i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any other authority;
- ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of trial Court.

17. It is, however, made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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