



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

215

CRM-M-27726-2025
Date of decision: 23.05.2025

Vijay Pal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate, &
Mr. Vikas Saroha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.430 dated 31.10.2020, under Sections 302, 201, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Ballabharh, Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the prosecution case is that petitioner along with five co-accused have caused injuries to the son of the complainant i.e. Akshay with stones and a broken slab of cement wherein he had sustained injuries on his hand, leg, chest and head, thereafter, the injured Akshay was taken to hospital where he was declared dead. The petitioner was arrested on 01.12.2020 and has been in custody since 4 years, 5 months and 19 days. It is stated that that no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that out of 21 witnesses, no one has been examined and trial is likely take a long time to reach its conclusion. He further submits that petitioner is not involved in any other case, as such, he be released on regular bail.



3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 4 years, 5 months and 19 days.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel(s), and the fact that petitioner is in custody for the last 4 years, 5 months and 19 days as of today and he is not involved in any other case as well as no specific role has been attributed to him in the present case, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, no prosecution witness has been examined till date. 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.

6. 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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

23.05.2025
anil

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