



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

Sr. No.220

CRM-M-23783-2026
Date of Decision: 12.05.2026

SAHIL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Sanpreet Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Present is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 355 dated 08.12.2025, registered under Sections 190, 191(3) and 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 307, 148, 149 of IPC) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sadar Rohtak, District Rohtak, Haryana.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Satish alleging that on 08.12.2025, an incident of firing took place on the Ghilod to Chhichhdana road wherein certain persons allegedly fired shots with an intention to kill the complainant Satish and his son. In the said occurrence, accused Vishal @ Vicky son of Rajesh, Pardeep and Himanshu were identified and legal action was sought against



them. On the basis of the said complaint, the present FIR came to be registered. During investigation, accused Vishal and Pardeep were arrested and their disclosure statements were recorded pursuant to which vehicles and a country-made pistol were allegedly recovered. The present petitioner Sahil son of Jitendra was arrested subsequently on 16.01.2026 during the course of investigation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and no specific role or motive has been attributed to him. Counsel further submits that the present case is a no injury case and the petitioner was not present at the spot. It is further argued that the petitioner has been nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Vishal @ Vicky and no recovery has been effected from his conscious possession. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.01.2026, investigation stands completed, challan has already been presented and the trial is likely to take considerable time as no prosecution witness has been examined till date.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed a reply, which has been taken on record, opposing the present petition. It has been argued that the specific role attributed to the petitioner is that he, along with co-accused Vishal @ Vicky, accompanied the other co-accused with the intention of killing the complainant and his son. It has further been argued that the petitioner was very much present at the spot and had reached there in a Venue car. Learned State counsel further submits that as per his



disclosure statement, the petitioner demarcated the place of occurrence. It is also argued that two other FIRs have been registered against the present petitioner. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner has remained in custody for the last seven months and five days.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book. Admittedly, the petitioner is not named in the FIR and has been nominated during investigation on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Vishal @ Vicky. No recovery has been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is also not disputed that the present case is a no injury case. The petitioner has remained in custody for the last seven months and five days. Investigation already stands completed and challan has been presented before the trial Court. Further, the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

6. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the custody period of the petitioner, the nature of allegations and the fact that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner Sahil is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case.

8. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

9. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

12.05.2026

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

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE