



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

2

**CRM-M-47424-2025
Reserved on :08.09.2025
Pronounced on: 10.09.2025**

KRISHAN LAL

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sanpreet Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This is third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The present petition is with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.64 dated 28.02.2022, under Sections 148, 149, 302, 323, 327, 451 and 458 of IPC, Police Station Sector 13-17, Panipat, District Panipat.

2. In nut-shell the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the basis of statement of Ronak, the son-in-law of deceased Rajbir. He had stated that in the intervening night of 27/28 Feb, 2022 his brother-in-law Mukesh had told him that his father Rajbir had been thrashed in Devi Lal Park, Panipat. According to complainant, he rushed to Devi Lal Park, where he and his brother-in-law Krishan found that his father-in-law Rajbir was lying there in the pool of blood and that he had suffered serious injuries on his head and forehead. According to complainant, Ramesh son of Raja Ram was also there and he too had suffered minor injuries. It was



further stated by the petitioner that he was having a suspicion that injuries on the person of his father-in-law Rajbir were inflicted by Ramesh.

3. It is the case of prosecution that during the course of treatment when Rajbir passed away, the dead body of deceased was got examined, post-mortem and other procedural formalities were completed. As per prosecution, the accused in this case has been arrested and the trial has already commenced.

4. Heard.

5. On behalf of petitioner, it has been contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that he has no nexus whatsoever with the commission of crime. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is in custody since 29.03.2022, which shows that he has already suffered sufficient incarceration. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the prosecution story itself shows that at the time of commission of offence, the petitioner was not present at the spot and that the only role attributed to him is that he transported and dropped the main accused on the spot on his motorcycle. According to learned counsel for the petitioner since trial is not likely to conclude in near future, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that this is third petition for bail on behalf of petitioner and that the second bail petition moved by him has been dismissed in the recent past i.e. on 16.05.2025. According to learned State counsel from the date of dismissal of previous petition no significant change in the existing circumstances has taken place and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.



7. The record has been perused carefully.
8. A perusal of record shows that the second petition moved by the petitioner i.e. CRM-M-12153-2025 (O&M) has been disposed of on 16.05.2025 and the order passed in the above mentioned case is as under:-

“Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of bail pending trial to the petitioner in FIR No.64 dated 28.02.2022, under Sections 302, 323, 327, 451, 458, 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station 13-17, District Panipat.

(2) After arguing for some time, when this Court was not inclined to accept the prayer, learned Counsel for petitioner on instructions wishes to withdraw the present petition.

(3) Disposed off as withdrawn “at this stage”.

(4) It is clarified that above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case in any manner.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.”

9. A bare perusal of the contents of the above mentioned order shows that although the order dated 16.05.2025 was not passed on merit but it contains a fact that the petition was withdrawn by the learned counsel for the petitioner when he sensed that the Court was not inclined to accept the bail petition.

10. In the above mentioned eventuality in order to succeed in the present petition, it is incumbent upon the petitioner to show that any change of circumstances from the date of dismissal of former bail petition has taken place. However, neither in the petition nor during the course of arguments any such circumstance has been pointed out.



11. Here it shall not be out of place to mention that otherwise also the trial is at the fag end as majority of prosecution witnesses have already been recorded in this case.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of above mentioned factores, one any change in circumstances, which were existing on the date of dismissal of former petition, have neither been pleaded nor proved. Hence it is hereby held that the present petition, which is the third petition for bail, is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

Pronounced on:10.09.2025

vipin

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No