

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

2025:PHHC:129581



108

**CRM-M-56569-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:17.09.2025.**

Arjun Khanna

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate and
Dr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Singla, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C., for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.766 dated 22.09.2021 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 302 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

As per prosecution, complainant Om Parkash, alleged that on 21.02.2021, at about 8.30/ 8.45 P.M., when he was present at the fish shop of his brother Ramesh Kumar (since deceased), five boys came in an autorickshaw for purchasing raw fish and when his brother demanded money for the same, they caught hold his brother and one of them inflicted blow on the left side of abdomen of his brother with a sharp edge object, as a result of which his brother sustained injuries. The other persons also slapped the complainant and his brother and when the complainant and his

brother raised alarm, the said persons fled away from the spot in the autorickshaw. Thereafter, the complainant shifted his brother Ramesh Kumar to KCGMCG, Karnal, from where he was referred to PGI Chandigarh and during the course of treatment, injured Ramesh Kumar succumbed to the injuries. Accordingly, the FIR in question was registered against the accused persons.

Learned counsel for petitioner has contended that the petitioner is entitled to concession of bail as other co-accused namely, Dinesh Kumar, Suraj @ Boda and Karan @ Imran Sheikh had already been granted concession of regular bail by learned trial Court, whereas co-accused Jai Ram was granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 27.10.2022 in CRM-M-21745-2022. He contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Karan @ Imran Sheikh, who had already been granted regular bail by learned trial Court. He has further submitted that the petitioner has been wrongly and illegally implicated by the police in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Karan @ Imran Sheikh and family of co-accused Karan @ Imran Sheikh had compromised the matter outside the Court with the complainant. The conclusion of trial of the case will take considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in further custody. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail on the ground of parity.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the present petition and submitted that fatal blow has been attributed to the petitioner and he has also been attributed slap and fist blows and the case of

the petitioner is not at parity with the other co-accused, who had been granted bail. He further submits that the petitioner is the real culprit in this case, who caused stab injury to the victim and recovery of knife had been effected at the instance of the petitioner and as such, in view of the seriousness of the offence, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail as he may influence the prosecution witnesses and abscond from the trial.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

In the present case, there are specific allegations against the petitioner that he stabbed the deceased with the knife and later on got recovered the knife as per his disclosure statement. Thus the role assigned to the petitioner is quite different than the role assigned to the other co-accused, who have been granted the concession of bail.

After completion of investigation, challan has been presented and trial is going on. Out of 17 prosecution witnesses, 12 prosecution witnesses have already been examined. In the status report, it has been submitted that complainant PW2 Om Parkash had deposed against the petitioner and has deposed that the petitioner had given knife blow in the abdomen of the deceased Ramesh. It has been submitted that the trial of the case likely to be completed in a short time. If the petitioner would be granted concession of bail, he may abscond from process of law or may tamper with the prosecution evidence. As per custody certificate, the petitioner had already been convicted in four other cases.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, seriousness of the allegations and gravity of the alleged offence where

one precious human life was lost, it is not a fit case where the petitioner is to be granted concession of bail.

Accordingly, without having any bearing or expression of opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is dismissed.

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

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

17.09.2025.

Komal

Whether speaking/reasoned?	:	Yes/ No
Whether reportable?	:	Yes/ No