

2026.PHHC.038201



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

123

CRM-M-66445-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.03.2026

Sonu @ Sonti

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. BS Saroha, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0181 dated 26.07.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 351(3) BNS and Section 25(1)(a) of Arms Act (Section 61(2) BNS added later on) at Police Station Dadri Sadar, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 6 months and 14 days. There is no overt act has been attributed to him of firing as stated to have been opened at the gate of the house of the complainant by co-accused Monu, Manish S/o Satinder, Manish S/o Jagdip, Bunty, Ravi, Sonu, however, no injury was caused to anyone. Charges have been framed on 10.11.2025, complainant stands examined, out of 26 PWs and supplementary challan has been presented on 03.02.2026. He is involved in three more cases,

wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant oppose the bail on the ground that the petitioner was part of the unlawful assembly and actively participated in the commission of offence. Learned State counsel, however, is unable to controvert with regard to custody, stage and petitioner being on bail in other cases.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for 6 months and 14 days; on bail in other cases; charges were framed on 10.11.2025, there are 26 PWs, out of whom only one i.e. complainant has been examined and supplementary challan stands presented on 03.02.2026, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under

Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not

be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

12.03.2026
ashok

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