

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

131

2026:PHHC:040558



CRM-M-52562-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.03.2026.

SACHIN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Anil K. Parmar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-44256-2025 and CRM-10405-2026

Applications are allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

Affidavit of complainant and Annexures P-5 to P-7 are taken on record.

The Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

Main case

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular
bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.356 dated 10.12.2024, under

Section(s) 115(2), 126(2), 351(3) and 3 (5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 117(2) and 110 of the BNS 2023 added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Rohtak, District Rohtak.

The FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Himanshu. As per the allegations levelled, on 10.12.2024, the complainant had gone to attend Gudchari function of one Atul's wedding of their village Samargopalpur where Sachin (petitioner herein) and Rajesh son of Lilu had come. It is stated that when the complainant left for home from there, both the accused persons blocked his way, and attacked him with iron rods and also threatened him with dire consequences. The complainant sustained as many as ten injuries in the said incident out of which six injuries were grievous in nature.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution during his testimony before the trial Court and that the petitioner is in custody since 27.03.2025 and thus has already undergone an actual custody of nearly one year.

State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts noticed above i.e. the custody period undergone by the petitioner and that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution before the trial Court.

I have heard the counsel for the parties and have also gone through the documents available on record. Taking into consideration the fact that the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution during his deposition before the trial Court, clean antecedents of the petitioner as well as the period of actual custody undergone by him which is nearly 01 year, the

present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on 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 be not construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

March 16, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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