

2025.PHHC.146370



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

234

CRM-M-41275-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 31.10.2025

Neeraj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 164 dated 11.03.2023, registered under Sections 302, 341, 506 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Shivaji Colony, Rohtak, District Rohtak.
2. The adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Satbir on 11.03.2023 alleging that on the same evening at about 08:00 PM, his son Parveen along with Naveen, a co-villager, who was also working with his son at one Zordus Sports Wear, Sheetal Nagar, were coming from their workplace towards their village on the motorbike of his son Parveen, which was driven by him, and when they reached near drain No. 2, they were intercepted by two youths, who came riding on a bike. One of them caught hold of Naveen and another struck blow with knife on the chest of

2025.PHHC.146370



Parveen and then they fled away on their motorbike, which was not having any number plate. On receipt of an information about the incident from Naveen, the complainant had rushed towards the spot. The victim Parveen was taken to hospital but had been declared to be brought dead. The complainant, while submitting that Naveen, eyewitness, had informed that one of the assailants was Amarjeet, who was nursing a grudge against the victim, he prayed for taking action against them. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, the statement of eyewitness Naveen was recorded on 11.03.2023. On the same day, accused Amarjeet was arrested. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and disclosed the name of the present petitioner as his accomplice. The petitioner was nominated as accused and was arrested on the same day. He too suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and demarcated the place of occurrence. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence against him. He is not named in the FIR. There is no other evidence to connect him with the crime. No injury on the person of the victim has been attributed to him. The complainant already stands examined and his statement does not incriminate the petitioner. He is in custody since 11.03.2023. He has clean

2025.PHHC.146370



antecedents. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. Conclusion of trial would take consideration time. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned State counsel that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature as he along with the co-accused had intercepted the victim. He had caught hold of the victim, whereas co-accused Amarjeet had struck blow with a knife on the chest of the victim, thereby causing his homicidal death. He was an active participant of the crime. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of trial as 06 witnesses have already been examined. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions of both the sides.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have wrongfully restrained victim Parveen on 10.03.2023 and caught hold of him, whereas co-accused Amarjeet is alleged to have struck blow with knife on his person. The injury sustained by the victim on his chest led to his death. The petitioner had actively participated in the occurrence by wrongfully restraining the victim and catching hold of him. The allegations against him are serious in nature. The complainant was not an eyewitness to the occurrence and, therefore, the fact that he did not say anything against the petitioner does not help him. Eyewitness Naveen is yet to be examined. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the part attributed to him, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the

2025.PHHC.146370



considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

31.10.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No