

2025:PHHC:165599



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.19338 of 2025

Vinod ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	18.11.2025
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	28.11.2025
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rahul Sidher, 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:-

2025:PHHC:165599



FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
264	24.09.2023	Bass, District Hansi, Haryana	302 and 34 of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Anil on 24.09.2023 alleging therein that his elder brother Kuldeep used to reside in the hutment built in their agricultural land whereas he was residing in Village Puthi. In the morning of 24.09.2023, dead body of Kuldeep was found lying at Dewan Paana Darwaja in Village Puthi. Blood was oozing out of dead body and he had been murdered. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of the dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted.

3. During the course of investigation, Anil submitted another complaint raising suspicion that his brother had been killed by the petitioner and co-accused Pardeep. The petitioner and co-accused were joined into investigation on 28.09.2023. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the murder of the victim and the petitioner got recovered a wooden binda used by him in the crime. The call detail records of the victim, the petitioner and the co-accused were also collected. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. A false recovery has been planted upon him. There is no eye-witness to the murder of the victim and no incriminating circumstance has been collected against the petitioner. The material witnesses Virender,

2025:PHHC:165599



Sunil who was alleged witness of last scene and Ram Bhagat have since been examined and have not supported the prosecution version. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Co-accused Pardeep has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. There are no chances of his absconding. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have committed the murder of the victim on the night of 23.09.2023. He is in custody since 28.09.2023. The co-accused Pardeep whose case is on similar footing has since been extended benefit of bail. PW-2 Sunil who had allegedly seen the victim with the petitioner and the co-accused has not supported the prosecution version. The trial is obviously likely to take time to conclude. There is no direct eye-witness to the murder of the victim. Though the complainant has not been examined but he was not eye-witness to the occurrence. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is

2025:PHHC:165599



surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

28.11.2025
harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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