



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

CRM-M-43248-2025
Date of decision: 29.09.2025

DEEPAK

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Ojas Bansal, Advocate and
 Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.474, dated 16.12.2024, registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak under Section 103(1) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act (Section 3(5) of BNS, 2023 added later on).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. In compliance of order dated 13.08.2025, reply by way of an affidavit of Rakesh Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kalanaur, District Rohtak, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

4. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 16.12.2024,



one dead body was recovered near Patwar Khana in village Kalanaur and the police party reached the spot. The dead body was identified to be that of Nihal Singh son of Ranjit Singh. His cousin Sukhdev Singh gave a statement to the police that on 16.12.2024 at around 6.00 AM, dead body of Nihal Singh was found near Patwar Khana and when he along with other family members reached there, they identified the dead body and suspected that he has been murdered by some unknown persons by stabbing him with a knife. He further disclosed that they have come to know that four persons had dropped him during the night near the banquet hall of village Kalanaur. Thereafter, four persons namely Sagar, Mukesh, Ashok and Praduman were joined in the investigation with whom the deceased had come and they had dropped him at around 12.45 AM near the banquet hall after attending the Kuan Poojan ceremony of the daughter of one Sahil in village Dhohad. Thereafter, complainant made second statement that, when his cousin was going towards his home after he was dropped near the banquet hall, Ravi, Akash, Sukhbir and Deepak (petitioner) had caused injuries to him with a knife resulting in his death. On 17.12.2024, Ravi and Deepak were arrested and they suffered disclosure statements admitting having committed the offence and disclosed that they were consuming alcohol at the house of Ravi along with Akash and Sukhbir, when deceased also came there. He had a quarrel with Akash and thereafter, they all committed his murder by causing injury to him with a knife. Thereafter, accused Akash was arrested on 23.12.2024 and he got recovered the knife used in committing the crime as well as his own clothes which he was wearing at the time of



occurrence. On 28.12.2024, Sumit-PW got recorded his statement and after completion of usual investigation, final report has been presented for trial.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated. It was a blind murder, which had not been witnessed by anyone. Initially, FIR was lodged with the allegations that some unknown persons have committed the murder of Nihal Singh. Thereafter, supplementary statement was given to the effect that four persons namely Ravi, Akash, Sukhbir and Deepak have committed the crime and the accused namely Ravi and Deepak were arrested on 17.12.2024. Learned counsel further contended that there is no evidence against the petitioner except his own disclosure statement as well as disclosure statement suffered by co-accused. Nothing has been recovered from his possession. There is no history of any past enmity with the deceased, which could be a motive for committing the crime. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner is in custody since 17.12.2024 and out of total 27 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 03 witnesses have been examined till date. The trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and no useful purpose will thus be served by detaining the petitioner in custody any more and he may be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from, ASI Amit has opposed the bail and argued that in view of the gravity of offence, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

7. No one has been named in the FIR and no one had witnessed the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has been named merely on the basis of suspicion and after his arrest, he has suffered disclosure statement admitting having committed the offence. There is no other evidence



against the petitioner except his own disclosure statement. As to how much evidentiary value will be attached to the disclosure statement shall also be a subject matter of trial. There is also no allegation that there was any past enmity between the petitioner and the deceased, which could be a motive for committing the crime. Petitioner is in custody since 17.12.2024 and the trial will certainly take a long time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he is entitled to be released on bail.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

9. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

29.09.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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