



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M No.40932 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:06.11.2025

Sahil @ Peena

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC, the FIR No.109 dated 21.01.2021, has been lodged in Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat. The petitioner has been arrested in the above mentioned case as an accused. Since the petitioner is in custody, he has filed the present petition for the benefit of bail. This is second petition under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of bail on the ground of delay in trial.

2. Heard.

3. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has already served a sentence of more than 4 years and 07 months and that the present bail petition has been moved on the ground of delay in trial only.

4. In response thereto, the learned State counsel has submitted that out of 32 witnesses, 17 witnesses have already been examined, and one has



been given up. As per learned State counsel, the State will make every effort to examine all the witnesses very soon, so that the trial can be completed within a short span.

5. The record has been perused carefully.
6. A perusal of record shows that first application moved by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on merit on 30.07.2024, and thereafter there has been significant progress in the trial. It is also relevant to mention here that to maintain the second petition for bail it is incumbent upon the petitioner to show that there is change in circumstance from the date of dismissal of former bail petition. However, except delay in trial no other ground has been raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.
7. Since the trial is already taking place at a reasonable pace and the assurance has been given by learned State counsel that prosecution evidence will be concluded shortly, it is hereby held that no ground for maintaining the second petition for bail is made out. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed. However, the learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within a period of two months.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

06.11.2025
Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No