

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

2026:PHHC:011961



CRM-M-42277-2025 (O&M).
Date of decision: 28.01.2026.

SATYAM SOOD

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana, assisted by
SI Anil Kumar, No.45, Police Station, Ambala Cantt.

Ms. Kiran Bala Jain, Advocate, with
Ms. Anjali Jain, Advocate,
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.252 dated 24.06.2024, under Section(s) 148,149, 307,
324 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 326, 120-B and 201 IPC
added later on), registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt, District Ambala.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of Sunil @
Shanu on the allegations that on the day of incident, injured Rakesh Rathi had

come to him and while he was standing, he got phone calls from his friend Jatin and Sandeep @ Kachu, who told him to come at the house of Satyam Chadda i.e. the present petitioner. It has been further alleged that on his asking, injured Rakesh Rathi told him that 2 days earlier Sandeep Kachu had told him to arrange a seat for his relative but neither Sandeep Kachu came there nor he attended the call. Therefore, injured Rakesh Rathi was not happy with Sandeep Kachu and to placate the former, Jatin and Sandeep Kachu called him. It has been further alleged that on the request of injured Rakesh Rathi, complainant Sunil @ Shanu also accompanied him and went at the shop of Satyam Chadda i.e. the petitioner where Sandeep Kachu, Jatin, Manish Balmiki, Satyam Chadda and one more boy whom they were calling Mama were already present. Thereafter injured Rakesh Rathi asked Sandeep @ Kachu as to why he was calling him since evening telephonically and on that Sandeep Kachu said that he had come to know that Rakesh Rathi was searching for him to beat him but before that he would teach him a lesson and thereafter Sandeep Kachu hit Rakesh Rathi with knife/ machete (used to cut coconut) on his head, Jatin hit Rakesh with axe which hit on his right hand middle finger, Manish hit Rakesh with beer bottle which hit on his eyes and left cheek. Sandeep Kachu again hit Rakesh on his left elbow, Satyam Chadda i.e. the present petitioner and one boy named Mama also caught hold of Rakesh Rathi and beat him with kicks and fist blow. It has been further alleged that when the complainant Sunil @ Shanu tried to rescue Rakesh, Jatin hit him with axe on his waist from back and thereafter Satyam Chadda hit beer bottle on his head and thereafter all of them fled away from the spot. Accordingly, FIR in the present case was registered.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled, the petitioner along with one boy namely Mama, is alleged to have caught hold of Rakesh Rathi, given him fist blows and is also alleged to have hit the complainant Sunil @ Shanu with a beer bottle. He submits that both the said allegations are not borne out from the investigation. As a matter of fact, the petitioner was not instrumental in causing any injury, rather, he was mediating so that the fight could be stopped. The incident in question has been captured in a CCTV camera which corroborates that the petitioner was attempting to stop the fight. It is argued that so far as complainant Sunil @ Shanu is concerned, he has already sworn an affidavit dated 29.06.2024 to the effect that the petitioner had not caused any injury to anyone and that he, in fact, was trying to stop the fight. The statement of Rakesh Rathi was also recorded by the police on 10.07.2024, wherein the only grievance expressed against the petitioner was that he had not stopped the fight. He contends that under the given circumstances, the participation of the petitioner in the offence is an arguable issue which would be determined during trial. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2024 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than one year and two months. It is contended that out of 19 witnesses cited by the prosecution, none has been examined so far.

State counsel, on the other hand, on instructions does not dispute the aforesaid facts, however, she contends that the petitioner is involved in large number of other cases i.e. nearly 11 cases, but they are substantially for commission of offences under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. She thus contends that the petitioner has criminal

antecedents and is thus not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Counsel for the complainant reiterates the same allegations.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by petitioner, which is more than 1 year and 02 months, the stage of the trial where the evidence is yet to commence, the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and subsequent affidavits sworn by Sunil @ Shanu complainant and the injured witness, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

January 28, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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