



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39487-2025

Reserved on: 30th October, 2025Pronounced on: 6th November, 2025

Anil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Joginder Siwach, 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. 785 dated 12.09.2023 registered under Sections 302, 201, 346 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Barwala, District Hisar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was initially registered under Section 346 of IPC on the basis of complaint lodged by complainant Pawan Kumar alleging that his son Bhaskar had gone missing from his house on 06.05.2023 and could not be traced despite the fact that searches were made for him. Investigation proceedings were initiated. On 20.09.2023, one Lakshay @ Dhola contacted the Investigation Officer of the case and disclosed to him that the present petitioner and co-accused Sumit @ Sachin were his relatives and about two months back, he was consuming liquor with Sumit at village Panihari, bus stand. Under the influence of liquor, the



accused Sumit had disclosed to him that the victim had been killed by him along with the present petitioner Anil about four months back in connivance with the accused Dinesh that he was quite scared now. This witness further told the Investigating Officer that he also made a call to the present petitioner and recorded the conversation between them which showed that the petitioner was also involved in the murder of the victim whose dead body was thrown by them in Panipat Canal. The witness Lakshay also handed over a pen drive containing the recorded conversation. The petitioner and co-accused were nominated as such. Offences under Sections 302 and 201 of IPC were added. It was revealed that on 15.05.2023, the dead body of the victim was received at Police Station Sector 13-17, Panipat and a case under Sections 279 and 304-A of IPC was registered. The father of the victim was joined in investigation. Photographs of the dead body were shown to him which were identified to be that of his son Bhaskar. The fisra samples of the deceased had already been taken up for DNA analysis and the same matched with the father of the victim. The petitioner was arrested on 06.10.2023. The co-accused Sumit was also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of extra judicial confession allegedly suffered by the co-accused Sumit which cannot be considered to be admissible against him. The said accused has already been extended benefit of bail. There is no eye-witness to the occurrence and there is no incriminating material to connect him with the crime. He has clean antecedents. He has been in custody since 06.10.2023. There is no circumstance of connect him with the crime. The trial will take considerable



time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Co-accused Sumit has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have caused the death of the victim Bhaskar on 15.05.2023 and to have caused disappearance of the dead body to conceal the evidence of offence of his murder. He has been in custody since 06.10.2023. Co-accused Sumit whose case is on similar footing has been extended benefit of bail. Trial is likely to take time as only two prosecution witnesses out of sixteen have been examined so far. There is no direct evidence to connect the petitioner with the crime and it is only after thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during the course of trial that it has to be decided as to whether the involvement of the petitioner in the offence of murder of the victim stands proved or not. The petitioner is obviously in prolonged incarceration. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. In view of the facts as enumerated above, but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds of two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court and further subject



to giving details of his present/permanent address, cell phone number and Aadhar Card, at the time of furnishing bonds before the learned trial Court.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

6th November, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |