



CRM-M-61366-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

123

CRM-M-61366-2025  
Decided on :22.04.2026

Sachin Kumar @ Sachin

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K.Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 309 dated 27.04.2025, under Sections 103(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS, Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonipat.
2. In the instant case, FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant, Irfan, against a total of five accused, namely Ashish, Gaurav, Raja, Rahul, and one unknown person. As per the allegations, accused Ashish and Gaurav were armed with knives and caused injuries to deceased-Amir, after catching hold of him.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR and was subsequently arrayed as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused persons. Learned

**CRM-M-61366-2025****2**

counsel further contends that even the “another person” mentioned in the FIR has not been attributed any specific injury either to the deceased or to any witness.

4. To strengthen his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner has produced copy of the order dated 27.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-60108-2025 by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court qua co-accused-Raja, who has been granted the concession of regular bail primarily on the ground that it was co-accused namely, Ashish and Gaurav who had inflicted the knife injuries. On the basis of the said order, another co-accused, namely Rahul, has also been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat, vide order dated 15.04.2026. Copies of the said orders are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

In view of the above, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioner was an active member of the unlawful assembly and, therefore, at this stage, it cannot be concluded that he is innocent. It is contended that, as per the investigation, petitioner shared the common intention of co-accused in the commission of the offence and is equally liable for the murder of Amir. Accordingly, it is prayed that present petition for grant of regular bail be dismissed.

**CRM-M-61366-2025****3**

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book, as well as the orders passed qua the other co-accused, who have been granted the concession of regular bail.

7. It is noticed that role attributed to the petitioner is almost similarly situated to that of co-accused namely Raja Kumar and Rahul, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail. Admittedly, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner, nor he was armed with any weapon. Petitioner is neither named in the FIR nor has any specific role been assigned to him. Petitioner is in custody since 30.04.2015 and, out of a total of 31 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date; thus, trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. In these circumstances, this Court is of the view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petitioner is held entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



CRM-M-61366-2025

4

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

22.04.2026

*Rashmi*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable:*                *Yes/No*