

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

222

CRM-M No.2570 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.05.2025

Ankush

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Sanpreet Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in case bearing FIR No.19 dated 10.01.2021 under Sections 302, 34 IPC (Charge sheeted under Section 120-B, 302, 201, 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act) registered at Police Station Assandh, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is based on disclosure of co-accused namely Sahil, in a supplementary statement of PW6-Jitender. It is alleged that Krishan @ Murli had made plan to kill Pawan. On 09.01.2021, the accused-Krishan alongwith the present petitioner came to other co-accused namely Sahil and made a plan to kill Pawan. Thereafter, Pawan was stabbed by Krishan @ Murli with a knife and then the knife was taken by the present petitioner and he also gave blows to the deceased-Pawan. It is stated that there is no eye witness account and the case of the prosecution is based on disclosure statement of co-accused Sahil. The knife has been recovered from the possession of co-accused Krishan @Murli whereas nothing has been recovered from the possession of the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends the petitioner is behind

bars since 18.03.2021 and as of date, has undergone 04 years, 01 month and 19 days of incarceration. He further contends that out of 27 prosecution witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing custody certificate dated 06.05.2025. However, he does not refute the fact that out of 27 prosecution witnesses, only 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 04 years, 01 month and 19 days and only 12 witnesses out of total 27 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the conclusion of the trial is not likely to conclude in near future and continuous detention of the petitioner pending trial, would not serve the ends of justice. In the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. The pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

9. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

07th May, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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