

2026:PHHC:019548



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.59689 of 2025

Satyadeep ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	03.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	10.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	10.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Advocate and
Ms. Neha Lakhanpal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Vishal Malik, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
1268	02.12.2023	Hisar Sadar, District Hisar	147, 148, 149, 201, 302, 307, 341, 427, 506 and 120-B of IPC and 25 (1-B) (a), 25(6) and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. As per the allegations, on 01.12.2023, the complainant-Jitender Singh was present at a well of his village and was having convesation with his companions-Naresh, Surender and Savinder. In the meanwhile, his cousin brother-Vikas @ Keshi also reached there along with his vehicle along with his co-villagers namely, Sonu @ Molar and Ajay @ Hanuman. As soon as, Vikas @ Keshi stopped his vehicle, two motorbikes and one car reached and stopped at some distance. Several youths were occupying these vehicles. Four bike riders alighted from their vehicles and started firing shots with pistols while aiming at Vikas @ Keshi. They also extended threats to kill whoever came in their way. His cousin brother Vikas @ Keshi and his friends Sonu @ Molang and Ajay @ Hanuman also sustained fire arms injuries. Thereafter, while extending threats to kill the others, the assailants fled away on their respective vehicles while showing their pistols. The injured were immediately rushed to the hospital. Vikas @ Keshi succumbed to the injuries. The complainant disclosed that he had identified some of the assailants as Sunny Gujjar, Ankit, Sagar @ Bachhi, Rakesh @ Kala Khairampuriah and Ashish @ Lalu and that he could identify the other assailants on seeing them. He also disclosed that the petitioner and one

Ravinder @ Sonu were having old enmity with the victim and they used to

2026:PHHC:019548



extend threats to kill him and that they might have hand in the occurrence.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of the dead body of the victim was conducted. Inquest proceedings were also conducted. A Special Investigation Team was constituted. The complainant Jitender Singh and victim Ajay @ Hanuman recorded their supplementary statements on 16.04.2024, on the basis of which, accused Kuldeep @ Bender, Himanshu, Avinash and Parveen @ Pehalwan were arrested, On interrogation, they suffered disclosure statements disclosing their involvement in the crime. The accused Rakesh @ Kala Khairampuriah was arrested on 17.08.2024. He too, suffered disclosure statement admitting that he along with the petitioner and the co-accused had hatched a conspiracy and that on asking of accused Sunny Gujjar, he had a conversation with the present petitioner on Zangi App and had made plan to kill the victim. He also disclosed that as per the conspiracy, the present petitioner had given 40 live cartridges and cash amount of Rs.50,000/- to accused Sunny Gujjar and had also assured to financially help the shooters while not coming in the front. He disclosed that as per their plan, the victim had been assaulted by accused Sunny Gujjar, Ashish, Avinash, Himanshu, Praveen and Kuldeep on the fateful day.

4. As per the further allegations, the petitioner was arrested on 10.05.2025. He too suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned

2026:PHHC:019548



offences.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No specific role has been attributed to him. He is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. He was admittedly not present at the place of occurrence at the relevant time. No evidence has been collected against him by the investigating agency to connect him with the offence of murder of the victim. The evidence as to hatching conspiracy has also not been established. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

6. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he was an important link in the chain of conspiracy to eliminate the victim and had joined hand with accused Sunny Gujjar and others to kill the victim. He had supplied 40 live cartridges and money to the co-accused for facilitating the murder of the victim. He is a habitual offender being involved in one more case. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

2026:PHHC:019548



8. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused Rakesh @ Kala Khairampuria and others and in pursuance thereof, he is alleged to have supplied live cartridges and cash amount of Rs.50,000/- to facilitate the murder of the victim. The victim had sustained as many as 17 firearm injuries and was killed in a brutal manner. He might not be present at the time of murder of the victim, however, the allegations prima facie establish the factum of his being an active participant in the crime. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. The apprehension that he may intimidate them cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. It is well settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstances of each case. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the material witnesses are also to be weighed. So far as the extended/prolonged period of incarceration is concerned, the well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody is not sufficient ground for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in *Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242* and *State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)*. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations levelled



against the petitioner, the part played by him, this Court is of the considered opinion that merely on account of his extended custody, the petitioner does not deserve to be given benefit of regular bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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