



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

104+219

CRM-48510-2025 in/ and
CRM-M-45073 of 2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 06.05.2025

Anurag @ Kali

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**CRM-48510-2025**

Allowed as prayed for and Annexures A-1 to A-3 are taken on record.

Main case

This is a petition seeking regular bail filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.197 dated 16.05.2022 under Sections 302, 34, 120-B, 379-B, 511 IPC and 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station City Jhajjar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that in the death case of deceased namely Sonu which is allegedly, a single injury case, the role has been attributed to one Yogesh for causing gun shot injury to the deceased. Moreover, no role has been attributed to the petitioner and the alleged eye-witnesses namely Surender-PW1 who is complainant alongwith another eye witness namely Manjeet-PW2, have not identified the accused-petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, the petitioner is behind bars since 24.05.2022 and has undergone 02 years, 11 months and 13 days of custody. He further contends that out of 23 prosecution



witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 11 have been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing custody certificate dated 05.05.2025. However, he does not refute the fact that out of 23 prosecution witnesses, only 11 have been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 02 years, 11 months and 13 days and only 11 witnesses out of total 23 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and since, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

06th May, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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