

2025:PHHC:152353



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

CRM-M-29342-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 31.10.2025

Pronounced on : 06.11.2025

Narender Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Mayank Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Advocate
for the complainant. (Through VC)

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. 207 dated 26.12.2023, registered under Sections 302, 216 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by complainant Chandra Singh alleging that on the evening of 25.12.2023, he along with his son Bijender had gone to the matrimonial house of his daughter Manju in village Dhigrota in their Swift Desire car. They had left her house at about 08:00 PM and while they were on their way back and were passing through village Nava, he had got the vehicle stopped as he wanted to ease. While he was easing himself in the nearby fields, he found that one vehicle

2025:PHHC:152353



reached behind his car and stopped therein. Four youths alighted from the same, one of whom was identified by him to be the present petitioner. He was carrying a pistol. The petitioner made an exhortation, thereby calling upon other three youths to kill Bijender, son of the complainant and then one of them caught hold of Bijender while he was sitting in the car and within the sight of the complainant, the petitioner fired two shots, which hit his son. He raised clamour and then one of the assailants, who was already sitting on the driver seat, tried to hit him with the vehicle but he managed to save himself. Thereafter, all of them fled away. The victim was rushed to the hospital, who succumbed to his injuries. While alleging that the petitioner was having grudges against the victim on account of some money dispute, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted.

3. As per the further allegations, the petitioner was arrested on 28.12.2023. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and disclosed the names of the co-accused. He got recovered the vehicle used at the time of the occurrence. One pistol and five live cartridges were also got recovered. Co-accused were also arrested. 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 inordinate delay in lodging of the FIR, which has not been explained. The statement of the complainant as recorded before the learned trial Court is highly unnatural and improbable and does not inspire any confidence to connect the petitioner with the crime. In fact, he is a

2025:PHHC:152353



planted witness, who was not an eyewitness to the occurrence. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude as only a few witnesses have been examined so far. His continued detention is not going to serve any useful purpose. A false recovery has been planted upon him. Co-accused has been granted concession of bail. He too deserves to be granted the same benefit on the principles of parity. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner along with co-accused is alleged to have committed the murder of the son of the complainant on 25.12.2023. The complainant was the eyewitness to the occurrence. He has been examined before the learned trial Court and has supported the prosecution version. The trial is going on at a proper pace and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, 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. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for

2025:PHHC:152353



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.

06.11.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No