

2026:PHHC:032411



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

115

CRM-M-57145-2025
Date of Decision: 27.02.2026

SATYA PRAKASH @ SAT PRAKASH @ SATTU

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ukrant Mahajan, Advocate for the
petitioner.

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., 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.514 dated 14.12.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 302, 506 and 427 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Chandhut, District Palwal, Haryana. (Charges framed under Sections, 148, 452, 427, 323, 325, 307, 302 and 506 read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959).

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused had entered the house of the complainant party and attacked them. One Kesar Pal fired from his pistol at Simran, the sister of the complainant. A free fight took place during which various injuries were received by the complainant party, however, the entire incident resulted in death of abovenamed Simran. A danda was also recovered from the present petitioner.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that although a danda has been recovered from the petitioner, but no serious injury has been attributed to him and the injuries which have been allegedly caused by him to Mukesh and Satpal

were simple in nature. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 02 months and 10 days. It is further stated that out of 34 prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been examined in part and as such, the trial of the Court will take a long time to conclude.

4. Learned State Counsel 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. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 02 months and 10 days.

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 the last 02 years, 02 months and 10 days and that the trial will 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.

09. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 27, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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