



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

208

CRM-M-50794-2025
Date of decision: 16.09.2025

RAMNEEK ALIAS RAMAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Rahul Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant second petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 391 dated 09.11.2022 registered under Sections 506, 452, 302, 148, 149, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Purani Sabzi Mandi Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The present case arises out of a complaint lodged by Vikram Saini, addressed to the Station House Officer, Police Station Old Sabzi Mandi, Rohtak. The complainant stated that he is the father of two children, namely, Prince (since deceased) and Vanshita, aged 16 years. He alleged that about one month prior to the occurrence, a quarrel had taken place between his son Prince and the accused persons, namely Aman @ Lindi,

**CRM-M-50794-2025**

-2-

Sawan and Ramnik. Though the said matter was subsequently compromised, the accused continued to harbour enmity against his son. On 08.11.2022, at about 6:00 p.m., Balram along with his son Sawan came to the complainant's house while he was present there with his wife and younger brother Ravi. They inquired about the whereabouts of his son Prince and threatened dire consequences. Since Prince was not present at that time, the complainant assured Balram and Sawan that he would counsel his son. Thereafter, the accused left the place while issuing threats. Later that evening, Sawan, accompanied by Aman @ Lindi and Ramnik, again came to the complainant's house. Sawan called out loudly, upon which Prince descended from the roof and came towards the gate. At that stage, accused Sawan pushed Prince into the alley. The complainant, his wife and his brother Ravi immediately rushed outside. All four accused, namely, Aman, Ramnik, Balram and Sawan, dragged Prince into the alley. It is further alleged that Balram and Sawan then inflicted knife blows upon Prince, while the remaining accused assaulted him with kicks and fist blows. The complainant and his wife also suffered injuries at the hands of Balram and Sawan when they tried to intervene. Thereafter, the accused fled the spot after threatening them with dire consequences. Prince, who had become unconscious, was immediately shifted to PGIMS, Rohtak, where he succumbed to his injuries. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, FIR was registered under Sections 302, 452, 506, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 against the accused persons.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends

**CRM-M-50794-2025**

-3-

that the petitioner is in custody since 14.11.2022 and has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 2 years and 09 months. He contends that out of the 32 witnesses, no witnesses has been examined so far by the respondents and the role attributed to the petitioner is to the extent of having given the fist blow to the deceased whereas the death in question took place on account of stab injuries which are attributed to co-accused Sawan. He contends that the recovery of weapon of offence as well as the vehicle have both been effected from the co-accused Sawan. He contends that the petitioner is a young boy and is not involved in any other criminal case.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand does not dispute the aforesaid facts, however, she contends that the petitioner had caught hold of the deceased from behind. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner did not inflict any of the fatal blows on the deceased. It is also not in dispute that the earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.04.2024 i.e. one and half years ago and that no evidence has been recorded despite lapse of the said period.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the age of the petitioner, the stage of trial, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and lack of criminal antecedents, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.



CRM-M-50794-2025

-4-

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

SEPTEMBER 16, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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