

2026:PHHC:046415



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

137

CRM-M-41444-2025
Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

AMAN @ CHHANGA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

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

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.785 dated 09.11.2023 under Sections 307, 387, 506, 120-B and 379-B of the IPC and Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had fired at Satender Pal Singh father of the complainant and the incident had taken place due to an extortion call for Rs.2 crores. It is further alleged that the petitioner had procured the weapon from Haridwar and he was paid Rs.5,000/- and Rs.20,000/- for carrying out the offence.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the petitioner are false and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 03 months and 29 days, and out of 33 witnesses, only 10 have been examined so far. As such, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

4. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the

petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence because a country made pistol of .30 bore and two live cartridges were recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate produced by the State Counsel is taken on record.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for last 02 years, 03 months and 29 days coupled with the fact that the trial of the case is likely take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.
7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
8. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.
9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 24, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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