



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

**CRM-M-45971-2025
Date of decision: 23.09.2025**

SUMIT

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Tejendra Rajawat, Advocate
 Mr. Gopal, Advocate and
 Mr. Nandkishore, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.110, dated 24.04.2024, registered at Police Station Sector 53, Gurugram under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC.
2. Upon notice, learned State counsel has appeared and opposed the bail. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.
3. Status report by way of an affidavit of Yashwant Singh, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sadar, Gurugram, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.
4. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 23.04.2024, two persons had caused injuries to one person selling water balls/gol gappas by hitting him with broken glass bottle near the public toilet



opposite Wazirabad Mandi, who was taken to GH Sector-10, Gurugram. Police party reached at the spot and it was found that he has already died and the name of the deceased was disclosed as Arvind. His wife Archana got recorded her statement to the police to the effect that on 23.04.2025 at about 09:00 PM, her husband had made a phone call to her and asked her to buy ingredients for making the water balls. She brought the ingredients from the shop and returned to home and at about 11:00 PM, Ram Babu came to her house and told her that two persons have caused injuries to her husband and thereafter, she reached at the spot, where public had gathered and she was informed that two young boys had hit him with a broken glass bottle and ran away from the spot and she sought action against the accused. Statements of eye-witnesses were recorded and one mobile recording was also taken into possession and name of the assailants were disclosed as Akash and Sumit (petitioner) and they were arrested on 24.04.2024. After completion of usual investigation, final report was presented for trial.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that it was a blind murder. The complainant as well as Ram Babu had not witnessed the occurrence and they have already been examined but they have not supported the prosecution case. The petitioner is in custody since 24.04.2024. The trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and there is no possibility of petitioner winning over the witnesses and in view of his long incarceration, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he may be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the



bail and argued that no doubt complainant namely Archana and Ram Babu had not witnessed the occurrence, but the occurrence in question was witnessed by one Ravindra, who was a sweeper at the public toilet near the place of occurrence and he still remains to be examined. In case, the petitioner is released on bail, he may try to win over or intimidate said Ravindra and in view of the gravity of offence, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

7. Taking into consideration the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve concession of bail. Resultantly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

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

23.09.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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