

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

125-5 cases

CRM-M-58212-2025

DEEPESH SHARMA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

HARMEET

CRM-M-26674-2025

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

SATBIR KUMAR @ SATBEER KUMAR

CRM-M-27877-2025

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

YUVRAJ SINGH

CRM-M-50759-2025

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CRM-M-55434-2025

Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

HARSH

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Himanshu Munjal, Advocate for the petitioner in CRM-M-58212-2025.

Mr. Dushyant Rana, Advocate for the petitioners in CRM-M-26674-2025 and CRM-M-55434-2025.

Mr. Namit Khuana, Advocate for the petitioner in CRM-M-27877-2025.

Mr. Sanpreet Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner in CRM-M-50759-2025.

Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Robin Dutt, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

All these petitions are being disposed of by this common order since they arise out of the same FIR.

2. These petitions have been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioners in case FIR No.406 dated 22.12.2024 under Sections 61(2), 111(3), 308(4) and 351(3) of BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant is a Commission Agent by profession and he received a threat call on his mobile phone from the petitioners who claimed themselves to be the gangsters of the Lawrence gang and demanded Rs.1 crore from him. When the negotiations were going on to settle the amount, the instant FIR was registered. It is further stated that on the basis of CDR, one Harmeet Singh was arrested and he disclosed the names of co-accused Yuvraj,

Harsh, Satbir Kumar @ Satbeer Kumar and Deepesh Sharma. As such, the petitioners were apprehended in the present case.

4. Learned Counsel for the respective petitioners contend that the petitioners are innocent. Infact, it was a case of misunderstanding and even no threat has been executed till date as no amount has been paid by the complainant or received by the petitioners. They further submit that the matter has already been compromised between the parties. It is further submitted that all the petitioners are in custody for the last more than one year.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioners in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the present petitions. Custody certificates filed by the State Counsel are taken on record. As per the said certificates, the petitioners are in custody for the last more than one year.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant admits the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties and submits that the complainant has no objection, if the petitioners are released on regular bail.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners are in custody for the last more than one year and that the matter already stands compromised between the parties and counsel for the complainant has also made his no objection for granting bail to the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners deserve the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous

incarceration of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, they are entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

10. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

11. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioners are found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.

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

13. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

FEBRUARY 26, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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