



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28778-2025

Reserved on: 28th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 4th September, 2025

Vishal @ Nanak

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 72 dated 14.12.2022 registered under Sections 302, 307, 394, 397 and 34 of IPC at Police Station GRP Rohtak.

2. As per the allegations, on 12.12.2022, the complainant Rahul along with the victim Vikas and Ramakesh, who were residing with him in the same rented accommodation, had gone to Delhi to drop his relative at the Railway Station. They had come back at Railway Station, Rohtak on the evening of 13.12.2022. While all three of them, were going towards their rooms and had reached near Hisar flyover, they were intercepted by three youths who were armed with knives. They snatched money from the complainant and his companion Ramakesh by showing knives. Thereafter, they tried to snatch money from victim Vikas, who resisted and then all three of them struck several blows with knife on his person due to which he



sustained serious injuries. The complainant and his companion Ramkesh tried to save him and then they had fled. Vikas had succumbed to the injuries and died at the spot. On the complaint of the complainant, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The complainant identified the petitioner and co-accused Naresh, as two of the assailants. They were arrested on 19.12.2022. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime and disclosed the name of the third assailant as Sahil and also disclosed that the offence had been committed by them in connivance with the co-accused Shibu. All of them were also nominated as accused and were arrested. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner is facing trial along with the co-accused.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was neither named in the FIR nor any motive has been attributed to him. No overt act has been attributed to him. A false story was concocted that he was a drug addict and had murdered the victim as he was in need of money. He has been in custody since 19.12.2022. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petitioner does not deserve to be allowed this.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have



intercepted the victim- Vikas, complainant and their companion Ramakesh on the night of 13.12.2022 and is alleged to have committed the offence of dacoity and on resistance made by the victim Vikas, who to snatch his money is alleged to have inflicted several blows with a knife on his person thereby causing his homicidal death. The allegations against the petitioner are quite grave and serious in nature. He was duly identified by the complainant. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. The well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in *Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC)*, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242* and *State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)*. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

4th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No