

2026:PHHC:080580



**(221) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-27745-2026
Date of Decision: 21.05.2026

Sachin Chhikara @ Cheena

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Rani, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The present petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.257 dated 18.03.2021 registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 452 and 120-B of IPC (Sections 191(3), 190, 103(1), 333 and 61(2) BNS) and Section 25, 27 and 59 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 201 IPC added later on) at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Anita and reads as under:-

“I, Anita, wife of Krishna, resident of Village Barona, am a housewife. I have two sons one named Dinesh and the other named Ajay (alias Bittu) who are currently in jail in connection with a murder case. Today, at around 1:00 PM in the afternoon, my husband Krishna and I were

2026:PHHC:080580



present at our home when we heard someone calling out "Tau-Tau" (Uncle-Uncle) at the gate. My husband opened the gate, and 8-10 men who were standing outside rushed inside immediately and shot my husband. As my husband moved from the gate towards the room out of fear, all 8-10 persons followed him inside the room and opened fire. My husband was riddled with bullets in his shoulders, stomach, chest, and other parts of the body.

I suspect that due to our old enmity, Muniya (a resident of our village) along with his associates and his brother Varjesh, and accomplices - Ramkaran (Baiyapur), Naresh, Jasbir, Ramesh Pahalwan (Nayabaas Gannour), Rajesh Sarkari, Neetu (Khanda), Pona (Madina), Ashish, Vikki (Chatana), Satyawan's wife Parvinder Kaur, Sonu Malik (Gandira), Shashi Prakash Vakeel (Adalat Sonipat), Mahesh (Haryana Police), Sonu Malik's wife Aarti, Muniya's mother, Anand (Gandira) all of them jointly shot my husband to death, or conspired to have the 8-10 persons who entered the house kill him.

About 3 months ago, Sonu Malik and Mahesh, who is employed in Haryana Police, had threatened me and my family with dire consequences. I request that legal action be taken against those who killed my husband. I have had this application written by my sister-in-law Anita. Signed: Anita RTI: 7027610993."

3. The counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR but only in the disclosure statement of the co-accused which is inadmissible in evidence. The CCTV footage does not further the prosecution case and the case against the petitioner rests upon conjectures and surmises. Some of the co-accused of the petitioner have been granted the concession of bail. As the petitioner is in custody since 05.07.2021 but only

2026:PHHC:080580



53 out of the 64 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused during investigation. It has been found that the petitioner was present at the spot and after he committed the offence by way of firing from a pistol, he handed over the pistol to one of his co-accused namely Monu Laheri from whom the recovery has been effected. The earlier bail applications of the petitioner have been dismissed on merits. The instant petition has been filed without any material change in circumstances. In fact, the Trial of the present case is proceeding at a steady pace with 53 out of the 64 prosecution witnesses having been examined. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner is alleged to have fired at the deceased and thereafter handed over the weapon to a co-accused from whom the recovery has been effected. Essentially, the petitioner is one of the primary accused. He is a habitual offender with 05 other cases registered against him emanating out of (1). FIR No.113/2021, under Section 148, 149, 323, 506, 34, 325 IPC, PS Murthal, Sonipat, (2). FIR No.191/2021 under Section 307, 120-B IPC, Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, P.S. City, Sonipat, (3). FIR No.256/2021 under Section 450, 34, 506, 120-B IPC and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, PS Kharkhoda, Sonipat, (4). FIR No.27/2021 under Section 302, 34, 120-B IPC and Arms Act, PS GRP, Sonipat and (5)

2026:PHHC:080580



FIR No.481/2021 dated 25.06.2021 under Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, PS Kharkhoda, Sonipat. As many as 53 of the 64 prosecution witnesses stand examined and the Trial of the present case is proceeding at a steady pace.

7. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

May 21, 2026

vishal

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable :- Yes/No