

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

2026:PHHC:092300



124-A

CRM-M-33268-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.07.2026
Date of uploading: 08.07.2026

Sunish Kumar Doomra

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Santpal Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Vini Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0219 dated 11.11.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 105 of BNS, 2023 and (Offence under Section 238 of BNS, 2023), registered at P.S. City Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out by the petitioner in the present petition) is as follows:-

“First Information Content: Copy of statement, Statement of Vishal Kumar son of Babu Ram son of Milakhi Ram resident of

Goniana Road near Pull Sua Kassi Sri Muktsar Sahib, age about 24 years, stated that I am a resident of the said address and work as a clerk with advocate Mandeep Sandhu at District Court Sri Muktsar Sahib. Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra have a shop named Aniket Traders, shop number 11, at New Dana Mandi Sri Muktsar Sahib. About 5/6 years ago, my father along with Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra and his son Ani Doomra jointly invested 20 Lakhs, out of which about 8/10 Lakh rupees were invested by my father, and installed a weighing scale outside the said shop, which used to operate every season, whose profit remained with Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra. My father, many times, to settle the account of the profit, asked Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra, but they would evade it every time because about 30 Lakh rupees were owed to my father by them. On dated 09.11.2025, the said persons called my father to their shop to settle the account, at that time around 05:30 in the evening, I received a phone call from my father that Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra and his son Ani Doomra, regarding the settlement of money accounts, have made me drink some poisonous substance and take me from their shop and save me. When I and my friend Kali son of Chet Ram resident of Tilak Nagar Gali Number 04 Sri Muktsar Sahib, riding on my motorcycle, reached the spot, we saw that my father was writhing on the counter built at his commission agency and the said three persons escaped from the back gate upon seeing us at the spot. Then we arranged a vehicle and got my father admitted to Sukhmani Multispecialty Hospital Trauma Centre Bathinda, where today on dated 11.11.2025 during treatment, my father died. The reason for enmity is that my father had to recover 30 Lakh rupees from them, because of which they made my father drink some poisonous substance, due to which my father died. Legal action should be taken against Sunish Doomra, Manish Doomra and his son Ani Doomra. I have got my statement reduced into writing and heard it, and it is correct. Sd/- Vishal Kumar.”

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 15.11.2025. Learned senior counsel

appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question primarily on the ground that the FIR-complainant suspects that there was a money dispute between the petitioner and the deceased, which was not amicably settled. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further urged that the cause of death was the consumption of Aluminium-phosphide and that there was no external injury on the body of the deceased; hence, it cannot be said that the petitioner had forcibly administered celphos to the deceased. Learned senior counsel has further urged that the possibility of the deceased having committed suicide and the petitioner being fastened with culpability thereof on account of the FIR complainant's suspicion that there was a money dispute cannot be ruled out at this stage. Learned senior counsel has further urged that the petitioner is a man aged 48 years and is the sole bread-earner of his family. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and, hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. She seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 07.07.2026, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner came to be arrested on 15.11.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 13.02.2026. Total 22 prosecution witnesses have been cited and out of which none has been examined till date. It is not in dispute that

the conclusion of trial will take long time. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

Further as per custody certificate filed today, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 7 months and 20 days and is stated to be involved in any other cases/FIRs. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

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

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

July 08, 2026
Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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