



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

221

CRM-M-51486-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20.08.2025

MANOJ

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Deep Rathee, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking regular bail in FIR No.46 dated 20.01.2023 under Section 34, 201, 302 of IPC registered at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat.
2. The case of the prosecution is that a dead body was found lying inside Drain No.8 Kanwali Nahra Road Bridge. It was a blind case, however, the name of the petitioner was roped in on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused namely Kuldeep as well as on the basis of last seen evidence by one Rahul and further on account of recovery of a rope which is alleged to have been used in the said occurrence.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner has undergone custody of 02 years, 06 months and 27 days and out of 26 cited witnesses, only 13 have been examined so far.



4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone custody of 02 years, 06 months and 27 days and out of 26 cited witnesses, only 13 have been examined so far.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Apart from the aforesaid material, there is no direct evidence on record to connect the petitioner with the present case. As such, keeping in view the above and the fact that the custody undergone by the petitioner is 02 years, 06 months and 27 days; out of 26 cited witnesses, only 13 have been examined so far and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.



11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

20th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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