

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

2025:PHHC:097100



**CRM-M-6534-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 31.07.2025**

**NARENDER KUMAR ALIAS NARENDER ALIAS TILLU
... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT**

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

Present:- Mr. Ashok Kumar Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 119 dated 13.03.2018, under Sections 302, 307, 109, 216, 120B, 34 IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Badshahpur Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been alleged that the brother of the complainant namely Anand Sharma and her wife Karishma were fired upon by Karamjeet Singh and Narender Kumar @ Tillu, the present petitioner. On hearing the gun shot noise, the complainant rushed towards the place of incident and took them to Artemis Hospital where Anand Sharma was declared 'brought dead' by the doctors. It has been stated that Karamjeet Singh has since been granted bail vide order dated 24.01.2024 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Gurugram (Annexure P-6).

3. Reply has been filed by the State in the Registry, the same is taken on record. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner

is in custody for the last 07 years, 03 months and 13 days. Learned State counsel further submits that out of 52 cited prosecution witnesses, 28 have been examined. He submits that the petitioner is involved in other cases also.

4. On a query, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is involved in other cases also, but in some of the cases he has been granted bail and in some cases, he is acquitted.

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

6. In view of the above submission of learned counsel for the parties, since the trial is likely to take a long time, the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 07 years, 03 months and 13 days and 28 out of 52 prosecution witnesses have been examined, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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 bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

31.07.2025

Janki

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