



CRM-M-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117 CRM-M-61920-2025

Indraj . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

203 CRM-M-655-2026

Sachin @ Satyam . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

Decided on :29.05.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Deepender Singh, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Dharamvir Singh, Advocate
Mr. Nipun Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-61920-2025).

Ms. Sakhsi Khera, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-655-2026).
(through video conferencing).

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

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This common order shall decide the fate aforementioned two petitions, seeking grant of regular bail, as the same have arisen out of same FIR, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner	Case No.	Crime Details
Indraj	CRM-M-61920-2025	FIR No.204 dated 20.07.2025, under Sections 115(2), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS (Sections 117(2) and 109(1) of BNS were added lateron),



CRM-M-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026

		registered at Police Station Gadpur, District Palwal, Haryana
Sachin alias Satyam	CRM-M-655-2026	As above

Case of petitioner-Indraj

2. After examining the record thoroughly and hearing learned counsel for the parties on 18.04.2026, the following was recorded in CRM-M-61920-2025:

- “1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.204, dated 20.07.2025, under Sections 115(2), 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS (sections 117(2) and 109(1) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Gadpuri, District Palwal.*
- 2. Learned Senior Counsel submits that, as per the FIR itself, on the date of the incident, i.e., 19.07.2025 at about 10:00 PM, complainant party had gone to the house of the accused persons.*
- 3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner further submits that both the parties are next-door neighbours in the village, and the alleged occurrence took place during night-time. Owing to this, complainant namely Rajender, got the FIR registered against multiple individuals, namely Sagar, Saurabh, Gaurav, Inderaj (present petitioner), Manju, Aarti, Nisha, Bijender, Pankaj, Sher Singh, Aasu, Gagan, Kavita, Sachin, Shivam, and 8–10 other unnamed persons.*

A perusal of the FIR reveals that no specific injury has been attributed to any particular accused with any specific weapon, except the one which is attributed to co-accused namely Shivam, and that injury has been declared simple in nature. However, six persons from the complainant



side—Rajender (complainant), Amar Singh, Yogesh, Nand Kishore, Savita, and Kanta—are stated to have sustained injuries.

4. *Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner's three sons, namely Gaurav, Saurabh, and Sagar, have already been arrested during investigation, and are presently in custody. Another co-accused, Sachin, who is a cousin of the petitioner's sons, has also been arrested and is inside jail.*

5. *Learned Senior Counsel submits that petitioner is in custody for a period of 8 months and 10 days. Investigation in the case stands completed, but the trial has not yet commenced, as process of recording of statement of the prosecution witnesses is yet to start.*

It is further argued that, in respect of the same incident, a cross-version was registered at the instance of Jagdish Chand, wherein 15 persons, namely Dayaram, Govinda, Parma, Amar Chand, Rajender, Yogesh, Gautam, Manish, Nand Kishore, Amar Singh, Bhola, Rajender, Amar Singh's mother, Amar Singh's wife, Jyoti, and 10–12 other persons—were arrayed as accused. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. *On the other hand, learned State counsel has placed on record a custody certificate dated 16.04.2026, which confirms that petitioner is inside jail for a period of 8 months and 10 days.*

7. *This Court has considered the rival submissions and perused the record available before it.*

8. *From the pleadings, particularly paragraph Nos.6 and 7 of the present petition, it is evident that petitioner – Indraj and certain other co-accused, namely Sagar,*



Saurabh, and Manju, have also sustained injuries during the occurrence.

For reference, paragraph Nos.6 and 7 of the present petition is reproduced hereunder:-

“6. That the petitioner is an elderly man of 55 years, suffering from the after-effects of head injuries sustained during the same incident, and his continued detention in judicial custody is adversely affecting his physical and mental health. The injuries sustained by the Petitioner during the occurrence are reproduced as below:-

Injured Inderaj (Petitioner):-

"1. Three lacerated wounds over scalp over frontal region of variable size, parallel to each other. Advice: NCCT Head, Neurosurgeon opinion.

2. Deep lacerated wound over the left parietal region of size approx. 6 x 0.5 cm. Advice: NCCT Head, Neurosurgeon opinion.

7. That following other injured persons received injuries on the side of the Petitioner:

Injured Sagar s/o Indraj:-

"1. Patterned bruise with reddish discoloration of right arm and forearm, upper aspect. Advice: Ortho opinion, Injury No.

2. Pain and tenderness over the frontal region. Advice: NCCT Head, Surgeon opinion, Injury No.

3. Pain and tenderness over the right thigh. Advice: X-ray right thigh AP & lateral, Ortho opinion.

Injured Sourav s/o Indraj:-

"1. Lacerated wound over right index finger.

Advice: X-ray right hand AP & lateral, Ortho opinion, Injury No.

2. Reddish discoloration with swelling over left forearm, posterior aspect. Advice: X-ray left forearm AP & lateral, Ortho opinion,

3. Abrasion of size approx. 4x4 cm over left arm.



CRM-M-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026

5

Advice: Ortho opinion,

4. Pain over left aspect of neck. Advice: ENT opinion,

5. Minor abrasion over right leg, anterior aspect.

Advice: Ortho opinion.

Injured Manju w/o Indraj:-

"1. Minor abrasion over right wrist joint. Advice:

Ortho opinion, Injury No.

2. Pain and tenderness over left shoulder. Advice:X-ray left shoulder AP & lateral, Ortho opinion,

3. Pain and tenderness over left elbow joint. Advice:

X-ray left elbow joint AP & lateral, Ortho opinion,

4. Abrasion of size approximately 4x2 cm over left leg, lateral aspect. Advice: Ortho opinion."

9. *Considering that dispute appears to have arisen from a quarrel involving the younger members of the families—three of whom are the sons of the present petitioner—and further bearing in mind that petitioner is the eldest member of his family, this Court is of the view that he may be afforded an opportunity to facilitate an amicable resolution of the dispute for the betterment of future relations between the parties.*

10. ***Accordingly, petitioner is ordered to be released on interim bail till the next date of hearing,*** subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. *List again on 21.05.2026, for further consideration.*

12. *However, it is expected from the petitioner that, while making efforts to resolve the dispute, he shall not align himself with the other co-accused, who are his own sons.*



Instead, he should seek the assistance of respectable members of the village to facilitate an amicable settlement. In doing so, he shall also bear in mind the root cause of the dispute, i.e. the alleged conduct of regularly consuming alcohol on the rooftop and engaging in objectionable behaviour by urinating in the direction of the complainant party's house."

Case of petitioner-Sachin @ Satyam

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no specific allegations have been levelled against petitioner-Sachin @ Satyam, and that he is not a resident of the same village. It is further submitted that petitioner has been named as an accused in the present FIR merely on account of his alleged presence at the spot. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody since 06.08.2025. Counsel also submits that co-accused namely, Indraj has already been granted the concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 18.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-61920-2025.

Submissions and subsequent developments

4. Again, when the petition was taken up for hearing on 21.05.2026, the petitioner(s) submitted that although it was the complainant party which had come to their house, and the incident in question thereafter took place, yet with a view to resolve the dispute and explore the possibility of an amicable settlement, the petitioner(s) along with their family members are no longer residing in the village and have started residing in the city of Palwal on a rented basis.



**CRM-M-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026**

7

For verification of the said aspect, proceedings were deferred to 29.05.2026, i.e. for today.

5. Mr. P.K. Jhanda, learned Senior DAG, Haryana, has filed a compliance/verification report by way of affidavit of Narender Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Palwal, District Palwal, which is taken on record.

6. By referring to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the report, it is submitted that as per the verification conducted by the Investigating Agency, petitioner-party is not residing in the village and is presently residing in the city of Palwal. It is further stated that complainant party has not come forward to join the compromise proceedings before the Panchayat members.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto.

Findings of the Court

8. In view of the facts and circumstances recorded hereinabove, including the aspect that there is no misuse of the interim bail by the petitioner-Indraj, it is noticed that though allegations of issuing threats have been levelled by the complainant through learned counsel Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, this Court cannot ignore the fact that despite the efforts made by this Court to facilitate an amicable settlement between the parties for the betterment of the coming generations, the complainant does not appear to be interested in resolving the dispute



**CRM-M-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026**

8

peacefully, even though both sides are stated to be residing in the same village/neighbourhood.

9. It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner's family is presently residing in Palwal and not in the village, and that three sons of petitioner-Indraj, who are co-accused in the present case, are still in custody. It is also an admitted position that it was the complainant party who had gone to the house of the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petitions are allowed.

Interim bail granted to petitioner-Indraj vide order dated 18.04.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-61920-2025 is hereby made absolute. Petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing fresh bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Petitioner-Sachin @ Satyam 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.

10. 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-61920-2025 and
CRM-M-655-2026**

9

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

11. Petitions stand disposed of.

12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

29.05.2026

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No