



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

223

CRM-M-47464-2025

Date of Decision : 04.09.2025

JAIDEEP**...Petitioner****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY**

Present: Mr. Vinay Singh Rathee, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shweta Nahata, DAG, Haryana.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

1. Second petition for grant of bail under Section 483 BNSS, has been filed by petitioner, a co-accused in case bearing FIR No.241 dated 28.09.2021, registered against him at Police Station HSIDC Barhi, District Sonipat, at the instance of one Sameer (complainant), for the commission of offences punishable u/s 302, 307, 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, the statutory mandate of Section 12 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 was not taken note of by the learned Additional Sessions Judge. Continuing further, learned counsel submits that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Harsh and Amit, have also been granted concession of bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide CRM-M-39415-2025 & CRM-M-51459-2024 on 29.07.2025 & 10.07.2025 (Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively). Even co-accused, namely, Gulshan has also been



granted concession of bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat on 06.12.2022 (Annexure P-5). Learned counsel further submits that lenient view be taken in favour of the petitioner, who has been in custody for the last 03 years. The crux of submission raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that since completion of trial is likely to take some time, further incarceration of petitioner in the circumstances as mentioned above would not serve any useful purpose, as also that if extended the concession of bail, petitioner undertakes to abide by all the conditions so imposed by the Court.

3. On advance notice, Ms. Shweta Nahata, DAG, Haryana, appears on behalf of respondent-State and submits that present petitioner is not at par with the other co-accused, who have been granted concession of bail, for petitioner was the person who inflicted fatal injuries on the person of the deceased (Imran) and life threatening injuries to his brother, namely, Sameer (complainant). Learned counsel further submits that trial is likely to conclude as only 04 prosecution witnesses remain to be examined. Based on these submissions, dismissal of the petition was prayed for.

4. Heard. Without adverting to the merits of the present petition, considering the fact that the trial is at fag end and only 04 witnesses are left to be examined, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the trial Court to make earnest efforts to conclude the trial expeditiously, preferably within a period of 02 months, from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

04.09.2025
Nisha Yadav

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No