



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-37511-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-8.8.2024

Ranjit ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ritesh Tomar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
395	28.4.2022	Camp Palwal, District Palwal	302 and 323 of Indian Penal Code

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The case of the prosecution is that on 28.4.2022 when SI Preetam Singh was present at Police Post Kithwari Phul, then an information regarding a murder in Rajeev Nagar was received. Upon receipt of said information, a police party rushed to the spot. Ragubir Singh moved a written complaint, wherein he stated that he had let out three rooms on the first floor on rent and that one of the room was occupied by his tenant Ranjit, who used to fight with his



wife frequently. It is alleged that on 27.4.2022 at about 8:00 AM he had heard the noise of quarrel coming from the room of Ranjit and later when both of them came out, he inquired about the reason for their quarrel and Ranjit disclosed that his wife is not willing to accompany him to his village. Later both Ranjit and his wife went out, but when they returned back at about 11:00 P.M. they were still fighting over the same issue and at about 1:30 A.M. he also heard screams coming from the room of Ranjit. When he went up to his room, Ranjit disclosed that he had murdered his wife by strangulating her.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the falsity would be evident from the fact that when complainant Ragubir Singh and other eye-witnesses were examined, they completely resiled from their statements. Learned counsel, in this regard, has drawn the attention of this Court to the testimonies of Ragubir Singh as well as of other PWs annexed with the petition.
4. Learned State counsel, has however, opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner having been specifically named in the FIR, does not deserve any concession of bail. It is, however, not disputed that the star witnesses of the prosecution have resiled. It has also been informed that the petitioner otherwise has been behind bars since the last about 2 years and 3 months and is not involved in any other case.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Although the petitioner named in the FIR but the complainant, while in the witness box, did not support the case of the prosecution at all and turned hostile. The petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of 2 years



CRM-M-37511-2024 (O&M) (3)

and 3 months. The petitioner otherwise has a clean record. Under these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

7. The instant petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8.8.2024
Pankaj/G

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No