



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

188

CRM-M-70381-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.03.2026

Sumit Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG Haryana

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.208 dated 03.07.2024, registered under Sections 61, 109, 115(2), 117(2), 190, 191(3), 351(2) BNS & 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Naraingarh, Ambala, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 1 year and more than 7 months. In the CCTV footage, though he is visible, but no injury has been attributed to him. Co-accused Vikas @ Vicky and Vivek have been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.12.2025, Annexure P-6, after being in custody for 9 months, 24 days & 1 year, 4 months, 28 days respectively, the former having allegedly supplied the arms while the latter was also seen in the CCTV footage like the petitioner, however, there being no injury attributed. As per the MLR dated 02.07.2024, there are two injuries noticed, but all are on non-vital parts i.e. hands and legs. Therefore, there was no intention to commit murder. Charges have been framed on



29.10.2025, however, out of 33 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined.

No other case is pending against the petitioner.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioner was a part of unlawful assembly, wherein injuries had been inflicted to the complainant. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 7 months and 28 days; not involved in any other case; co-accused are on bail; charges were framed on 29.10.2025, however, prosecution evidence is yet to commence, 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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
M.Kamra

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