

CRM-M-41280-2025

2025:PHHC:150795



227
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41280-2025
Date of decision: November 03, 2025

Lalit @ Tubbi
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
...Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL
Present:- Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.279 dated 17.06.2021, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 148, 149, 323, 302, 307, 452, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short ‘IPC’) and Sections 25, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 (for short ‘Arms Act’), at Police Station Meham, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that complainant, namely, Jagdish alleged that on 16.6.2021, he alongwith his family was present at his house. His son-in-law, namely, Anesh (husband of his daughter-Soniya) had come to his house. He alongwith his son-in-law Anesh, sons, namely, Rohit and Nitin, his wife, namely, Roshni and Sandeep (son of Satyawan) were sitting in his house and they were talking, when at around

CRM-M-41280-2025

09:00 p.m., Bala wife of Kuldeep crossed his house while abusing and threatening. After that, 4-5 motorcycles stopped in front of house of the complainant; and 5-6 boys after entering inside the house, started firing indiscriminately. Scared, the complainant hid himself at one side of the bed; his son-Rohit, his son-in-law-Anesh and Sandeep (son of Satyawar) sustained injuries in firing. After hearing the firing, his daughter-Soniya came at the spot. The complainant and wife-Roshni and his daughter raised noise and tried to chase the accused, but the accused fled away from the spot while firing and threatening. In the scuffle, he got hold the pistol of Amit @ Meetu. When the complainant tried to chase him, then they left one motorcycle at the spot and the other boys who were standing outside left the spot while firing. Injured-Rohit succumbed to his injuries.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 18.07.2021. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has iterated that prime prosecution witnesses, namely, PW1-Sheela, PW2-Roshni, PW3-Jagdish (FIR-complainant), PW4-Sandeep, PW5-Avnish and PW6-Soniya have turned hostile, and, thus trial is not likely to culminate into conviction. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of an affidavit dated 02.11.2025 of Rishabh Sodhi, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Meham, District Rohtak in the Court today, which is taken on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail.

CRM-M-41280-2025

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 18.07.2021 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan has been presented on 30.08.2021. Total 59 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, only 06 have been examined till date. Indubitably, the conclusion of trial will take its own time. The rival contention raised at Bar; including weightage required to be attached to the hostile testimonies of the aforesaid prosecution witnesses; give rise to debatable issues, which shall essentially be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. Indubitably, the present petition is the second attempt by the petitioner to secure regular bail. The last bail plea preferred by the petitioner was dismissed on 18.03.2025. However, keeping in view the entirety of the factual matrix of the case in hand; especially, factum of the petitioner having suffered incarceration for another more than 07 months, pace of trial, and the prime prosecution private witnesses turning hostile when their testimony was recorded after rejection of earlier bail plea; this Court is inclined to affirmatively consider the instant plea for bail. A profitable reference, in this regard, can be made to a judgment of this Court passed in ***CRA-S-2332-2023*** titled as ***Rafiq Khan versus State of Haryana and another***, relevant whereof reads as under:

“10. As an epilogue to the above discussion, the following principles emerge:

CRM-M-41280-2025

I Second/successive regular bail petition(s) filed is maintainable in law & hence such petition ought not to be rejected solely on the ground of maintainability thereof.

II. Such second/successive regular bail petition(s) is maintainable whether earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or earlier petition was dismissed on merits.

III For the second/successive regular bail petition(s) to succeed, the petitioner/applicant shall be essentially/pertinently required to show substantial change in circumstances and showing of a mere superficial or ostensible change would not suffice. The metaphoric expression of seeking second/successive bail plea(s) ought not be abstracted into literal iterations of petition(s) without substantial, effective and consequential change in circumstances.

IV No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute substantial change in circumstances as every case has its own unique facts/circumstance. Making such an attempt is nothing but an utopian endeavour. Ergo, this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such second/successive regular bail petition(s).

V In case a Court chooses to grant second/successive regular bail petition(s), cogent and lucid reasons are pertinently required to be recorded for granting such plea despite such a plea being second/successive petition(s). In other words, the cause for a Court having successfully countenanced/entertained such second/successive petition(s) ought to be readily and clearly decipherable from the said order passed.”

6.2. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer herein a judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh vs. State of Maharashtra and anothers, 2024(3) RCR (Criminal) 494***, which reads thus:

“18. Criminals are not born out but made. The human potential in everyone is good and so, never write off any criminal as beyond redemption. This humanist fundamental is often missed when dealing with delinquents, juvenile and adult. Indeed, every saint has a past and every sinner a future. When a crime is committed, a variety of factors is responsible for making the offender commit the crime. Those factors may be social and economic, may be, the result of value erosion or parental neglect; may be, because of the stress of circumstances, or the manifestation of temptations in a milieu of affluence contrasted with indigence or other privations.

19. If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

CRM-M-41280-2025

20. We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly, howsoever stringent the penal law may be.

21. We are convinced that the manner in which the prosecuting agency as well as the Court have proceeded, the right of the accused to have a speedy trial could be said to have been infringed thereby violating Article 21 of the Constitution.”

6.3. As per custody certificate dated 31.10.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 04 year, 03 months and 10 days, & is not shown to be involved in any other FIR(s).

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed

CRM-M-41280-2025

hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

November 03, 2025
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No