

2025:PHHC:094489



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.18095 of 2025
Date of Decision: 29.07.2025
Reserved on: 23.07.2025

Nadeem ... Petitioner

Versu

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ashish Grewal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
988	08.12.2023	Yamuna Nagar City, District Yamuna Nagar	346, 302 and 201 of IPC

2. The aforementioned FIR was initially registered under Section 346 of IPC on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Jaggu Chaurasia alleging that one of his five sons namely, Rudal Ba who got married about seven months back, had left home on the night of 06.12.2023 and was missing since then. Investigation

2025:PHHC:094489



proceedings were initiated. On 14.12.2023, his dead body was recovered from the bushes from the area of old Hamida. The postmortem examination was conducted. The petitioner was apprehended on 16.12.2023. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he used to consume liquor and other intoxicating substances in the company of the victim with whom he was having friendly relations. The victim used to make him spend money for buying liquor etc. and whenever he insisted the victim to pay money, he used to hurl abuses to the petitioner. He disclosed that verbal altercations had taken place between them due to that reason and he started nursing grudges against the victim to that extent that he had planned to kill him. He further disclosed that after hatching a plan, he had called the victim in a vacant plot on the night of 06.12.2023. They had consumed smack. The petitioner asked the victim to pay money for the same and on his refusal, a scuffle started between them and thereafter he gave a kick on the private part of the victim due to which he fallen down. Then the petitioner had strangled him with the help of a plastic bag cutting which he was already carrying and had concealed his dead body behind the bushes. He also disclosed that the mobile phone of the victim was taken by him. He also got recovered the plastic scrap used for strangulating the victim. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner is facing trial for commission of offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 346 of IPC.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. The trial

2025:PHHC:094489



will take time. There is no direct evidence to connect him with the murder of the victim. The disclosure statement allegedly suffered by him cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. A false recovery has been planted upon him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be given benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have called the victim on the night of 06.12.2023 in a vacant plot where he consumed smack along with him. He is further alleged to have an altercation with the victim. He kicked the victim on his private part which resulted into his becoming unconscious and then he is alleged to have strangled the victim. As per the postmortem report, multiple bruises were found on the dead body and cause of death is shown to be constriction of neck consequent upon ligature strangulation and its complications. The respondent-State has also placed on record Annexure R-7 copy of call detail record of the mobile phones of the victim and the petitioner which show that some calls were exchanged between them on the day of occurrence. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Keeping in view the gravity thereof, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but

2025:PHHC:094489



without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

29.07.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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