



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134

CRM-M-66828-2025
Decided on : 11.03.2026

SACHIN
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Nikhil Vats, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Aayush Bansal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sachin	376	10.12.2021	147, 148, 149, 302, 341 and 506 of IPC (later on sections 120-B and 34 of IPC added and sections 147, 148, 149 IPC deleted at the time of filing challan)	Salhawas	Jhajjar



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that FIR was registered at the instance of Surrender, alleging that on 10.12.2021, at about 11:00–12:00 noon, his son Akash, aged 22 years, was killed in his presence by accused (i) Santram son of Ranbir, (ii) Vijay son of Jaipal, (iii) Sachin son of Santram (petitioner herein), and (iv) Ankit son of Vijay. It was alleged in the FIR that Santram and Vijay caught hold of Akash, while Sachin and Ankit, armed with knives, stabbed him. Two unidentified persons allegedly restrained the complainant when he tried to rescue his son. In the latter part of FIR, it was further stated that Akash was stabbed by accused Ankit, Sachin, Santram, Vijay, and another unidentified person, who all fled from the spot thereafter.

3. Learned counsel further submits that the case is false and fabricated, as complainant Surrender was not actually present at the place of occurrence. It is argued that, had he been present, he would have attempted to rescue his son, and his clothes would have borne bloodstains from the deceased.

4. Counsel for the petitioner points out that only three injuries were found on the deceased, out of which injury No.(iii) was merely a reddish grazed abrasion measuring 3×1 cm. Hence, prosecution version that multiple accused persons attacked the deceased with knives appears improbable, as in such a scenario, four or more stab injuries would have been expected.

Further submits that petitioner is in custody since 11.12.2021, and has, thus, suffered incarceration for about four years and two months. It is contended that, without charges having been proved and



in the absence of early conclusion of trial, petitioner cannot be kept behind bars for an indefinite period.

Additionally, it is submitted that similarly situated co-accused namely Ankit, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 27.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-11357-2025 (Annexure P-5). Accordingly, prayer is made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 10.03.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 04 years 02 months and 28 days period inside jail.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that at present, only two accused persons, namely Sachin (petitioner herein) and his co-accused Ankit, are facing trial. Other two co-accused, Santram and Vijay, who were alleged to have caught hold of the deceased Akash at the time of occurrence, were found innocent during investigation and accordingly exonerated. It is submitted that there are two knife injuries on the body of the deceased, and both the accused presently facing trial are responsible for inflicting the same. Learned State counsel, however, does not dispute the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, i.e. approximately 04 years, 02 months, and 28 days.



7. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that petitioner is the main accused, who was specifically seen by the complainant inflicting knife injuries on the deceased.

It is further submitted that out of total three injuries found on the body of the deceased, two have been opined to be caused by a sharp-edged weapon, which are attributed to the petitioner Sachin and his co-accused Ankit. However, learned counsel fairly concedes that only one knife was recovered by the investigating officer during the course of investigation.

8. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available on file.

9. It is observed that several aspects of the matter are yet to be established and can only be determined at the final stage of trial. Complainant, who claims to be an eye-witness to the occurrence, has already been examined.

On being asked by the Court, it has been pointed out that, as per the medical record, one Satnam had got the deceased Akash admitted to the hospital, and notably, clothes of the deceased were not recovered during the course of investigation by the investigating officer. It is also informed that out of total 34 prosecution witnesses, only 11 have been examined so far, including the material witnesses.

10. The issues raised by learned counsel for the petitioner need not be commented upon at this stage. However, considering the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations against the petitioner, period of



CRM-M-66828-2025

5

incarceration already undergone, and slow progress of trial, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the 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/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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 independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

13. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO