

2026:PHHC:016784



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH**

222

CRM-M-72370-2025
Date of Decision: 04.02.2026

SUNNY

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.829 dated 25.10.2023 under Sections 302, 120-B and 34 of IPC registered at Police Station Sector 8, Faridabad, District Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the son of the complainant was beaten by the petitioner alongwith his co-accused namely Hansraj and Gunit. Subsequently, the son of the complainant succumbed to the injuries allegedly sustained by him at the hands of petitioner and his co-accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are general and vague in nature. He further submits that as per the case of the prosecution, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that it was accused Hansraj who had inflicted a stab injury with a screw driver on the left side of stomach of the deceased, whereas the petitioner and co-accused Gunit are merely alleged to have caught hold of the deceased. He further also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 03 months and 05 days. It is further stated that the trial against the petitioner will take a long time to conclude as only two witnesses have been examined till date out of 22 prosecution witnesses.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are serious. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 03 months and 05 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 years, 03 months and 05 days and the trial will take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 04, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No