



CRM-M-36690-2024 (O&M)

1

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

111

CRM-M-36690-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 28.10.2025

Sunny @Chottu

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
(joined through hybrid mode)

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 302, 307, 341, 34 and 120B of Indian Penal Code and Sections 25 of Arms Act, the FIR No.171 dated 15.05.2018 has been lodged in Police Station Chandhut, District Palwal. The petitioner, who was afforded the benefit of interim bail vide order dated 03.10.2024, is seeking for regular bail.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the basis of statement of Rakesh S/o Sonu, hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. He had stated that on 14.05.2018, when he along with his wife was going on his motorcycle at about 12:30-12:45 in the midnight, three persons riding on a black colour



motorcycle, came there and they fired a gunshot upon him, vis-à-vis, on his wife, and that in the abovementioned incident, his wife passed away.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of abovementioned statement, the formal FIR in this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. During the course of investigation, identity of the petitioner as one of the assailants was established, and he was arrested on 01.06.2018.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered a lot of incarceration for being in custody for a period of 06 years, in the present case. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, on 03.10.2024 the benefit of interim bail was afforded to the petitioner and in the last one year, the petitioner without fail has been appearing before the learned trial Court, and participating in the trial. It has also been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has not indulge in any kind of illegal activity from the date of release on interim bail. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner is seeking regular bail.

7. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner is a person, who is having numerous cases pending against him, and that in



the present case, trial is taking place at a reasonable fast pace, as out of 26 prosecution witnesses, 20 prosecution witnesses have already been examined, and only 06 official witnesses are left.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has already served a in custody for a period of more than 06 years in the present case, and he is on interim bail for the last one year, and during this period, he has not misused the concession of interim bail, the order dated 03.10.2024, granting interim bail to the petitioner, is hereby made absolute. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly and till the conclusion of trial, the petitioner is admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.
- (ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final disposal of the case; and
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

10. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him



shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 28, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No