

2025:PHHC:148472



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24787-2025 (O&M)
Reserved on : 27.10.2025
Pronounced on : 30.10.2025

Krishan **...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 277 dated 31.12.2022, registered under Sections 323, 302 and 506 of IPC at Police Station Rozka Meo, District Nuh.
2. The aforementioned FIR was initially registered under Sections 323 and 506 of IPC on the basis of a complaint submitted by complainant Saroj on 31.12.2022 alleging that on 30.12.2022, the petitioner had opened an assault on her husband Bharat and had struck injuries with an iron rod upon his person. Due to the injuries sustained by him, he had fallen in the street, the complainant along with her son had rushed to the spot on hearing noises and had seen the petitioner while roaming around with an iron rod and proclaiming that the victim should be taken away from the spot and otherwise, there would be dire consequences. The injured had been rushed to the hospital. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The victim succumbed to his

2025:PHHC:148472



injuries and died on 01.01.2023. Offence under Section 302 of IPC was added.

3. As per the further allegations, the petitioner was arrested on 02.02.2023. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered the iron rod used in the offence. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eyewitness to the occurrence and the complainant and her son are planted witnesses only. A false recovery has been planted upon him. The victim was in a normal condition when he had gone to the hospital and this fact was affirmed by PW-2 Dr. Puneet. The trial is going to take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. Complainant Saroj has since been examined and has duly supported the prosecution version. All the circumstances also point out towards the involvement of the petitioner in the offence of murder of the victim. The death of the victim occurred due to the impact of the injuries sustained by him at the hands of the petitioner. The trial is going on at a proper pace. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding, if released on bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions of both the sides.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the victim with an intent to cause his death. The victim had succumbed to his injuries one day after the

2025:PHHC:148472



incident, when he was under treatment in the hospital. PW-1/complainant Saroj and her son had reached at the spot just after the occurrence and had seen the petitioner at the spot while carrying an iron rod. The fact that PW-2 Dr. Puneet deposed in his cross examination that the victim was alone at the time of admission and had come on foot cannot be considered to be relevant for the purpose of this petition. The allegations against the petitioner are specific and grave in nature. Keeping in view the severity of the allegations, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be granted benefit of regular bail, at this stage. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.10.2025
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No