



CRM-M-46511-2025

214

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

**CRM-M-46511-2025
Decided on : 19.12.2025**

Deepak alias Deepu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Manmeet Singh Rana, Advocate and
Mr. Aaryan Kargwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner- Deepak @ Deepu, aged 22 years, has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 270 dated 01.09.2023, registered under Sections 307, 341, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sadar Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri.
2. First bail petition filed by the petitioner-Deepak @ Deepu was disposed of being dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 13.12.2024 passed in CRM-M-12678-2024.
3. As per allegations, the FIR was got registered at the instance of complainant-Pradeep. When he was driving the motorcycle and his friends Sonu and Lalit were seated on rear seat, one bike boarded by three boys arrived there on spot and one of them seated namely Sanjay came near to the complainant and then



CRM-M-46511-2025

fired a shot, causing injury on the mouth (right side of the face).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the role attributed to the petitioner is not specified in the FIR, nor there is any explanation as to with what weapon the petitioner was armed. As per allegations, the petitioner was driving the motorcycle at the relevant time of the incident, however, no test identification parade was conducted during the investigation. Thus, the name of the petitioner has been nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Sanjay and one country made pistol alongwith one cartridge and motorcycle used in the crime has already been recovered from his possession.

He further argues that although charges had been framed on 20.02.2024, but till date only 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 22 prosecution witnesses. Thus, prays for concession of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the complainant Pradeep has already been examined as PW-7, though he has supported the case of prosecution and witness Sonu has also established the presence of the petitioner by identifying him in the witness box.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the record including the status report alongwith custody certificate produced before this Court. Admittedly, in the statements deposed before the Court, no specific role or causing any injury or firing of any shot has been attributed to the present petitioner. However, the fire arm injury is attributed to co-accused Sanjay and Khushi Ram @ Kala (who later on died). Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, only 10 have been examined, thus, 12 more witnesses are yet to be examined. Material witnesses i.e. injured/complainant-

Pradeep and Sonu have already been examined, therefore, chances of impressing



CRM-M-46511-2025

upon the witnesses no more exist. The petitioner is inside jail for the last more than a period of 02 years, 03 months and 07 days, thus, considering, the circumstances in its entirety, this Court finds merit in the prayer made in the petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed.

Consequently, petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. However, it is clarified in case the petitioner is found indulged in any manner with the tempering of evidence alone or in connivance with other accused, he will have to face the consequences and may be the bail concession is withdrawn on the asking of the prosecution.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

December 19, 2025

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO