

CRM-M-46343-2025

2025:PHHC:127608



115+227

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46343-2025

Date of decision: September 16, 2025

Lakhan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**Present:-** Mr. Akshay Kumar Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG 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.88 dated 18.04.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 25(1-B)(a) 29(B) of the Arms Act, 1959 (for short 'Arms Act') and Sections 109, 120-B, 302, 341, 216, 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), at Police Station Sector 37, Gurugram.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that on 18.04.2024, at about 2:00 p.m., the complainant's father was returning home from the plot for lunch when he was suddenly surrounded by Manjeet, Basant, Lakhan (petitioner herein), Mintu, Sanju, Kapil, Manish, and Kushal. At their instigation, Dinesh @ Timmu fired multiple gunshots at the complainant's father with a pistol, causing him to sustain multiple bullet injuries and collapse on the spot. Upon receiving information from passersby, the complainant

CRM-M-46343-2025

immediately rushed to the place of occurrence, where his cousins Pintu and Lalit had also arrived. By that time, the accused persons had already fled. The complainant, with the help of others, shifted his injured father to Ayushman Hospital, from where he was referred to Medanta Hospital, Gurugram. However, upon arrival at Medanta Hospital, the doctors declared him brought dead. The complainant further alleged that Dinesh @ Timmu had opened fire at the instance of the above-named accused persons, including Lakhan (petitioner herein), which resulted in his father's death. He also alleged that all the accused persons, along with Gajender, Shastri Deepak, Deepak Gujjar, Rishant, Munni Devi, Tonni Bhanja, Gautam, Parveen Solanki, Manju, Mohan, and Monu Chauhan, had entered into a criminal conspiracy with one another and were collectively responsible for the murder of his father.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 21.04.2024. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has iterated that assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the prime role attributed to the petitioner is that of conspiracy. Learned counsel has further argued that there is no material available on record alongwith challan which may be recorded that the petitioner was present at the spot when the murder in question took place. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further iterated that the FIR/complainant side has exaggerated the version and had implicated 22 persons as accused, but the police has chosen to file challan only against 8 persons. Learned counsel has further argued that prime prosecution witness, namely, PW – Sanjay (FIR/ complainant/ son of the deceased) has turned hostile. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and thus

CRM-M-46343-2025

the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record the custody certificate dated 13.09.2025, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

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

6. The petitioner was arrested on 21.04.2024 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 19.07.2024. Total 45 prosecution witnesses have been cited, but only 05 have been examined till date. It is not in dispute that the conclusion of the trial will take long time. The rival contentions raised at Bar; including the weightage/ veracity required to be attached to the testimony of the hostile witness; give rise to debatable issues, which shall 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. 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.

CRM-M-46343-2025

Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

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.”*

6.2. 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 as withdrawn on 05.12.2024. However, keeping in view further incarceration of the petitioner for a period of more than 09 months and no substantial progress in trial, 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:*

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

CRM-M-46343-2025

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.”

6.3. As per custody certificate dated 13.09.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 01 year, 04 months and 18 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate the petitioner is stated to be involved in other FIR(s). However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*, a Division Bench judgment of the Hon’ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

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.

CRM-M-46343-2025

- (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/Illaqa 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 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

September 16, 2025
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No