



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

215

**CRM-M-51364-2025
Date of decision: 17.09.2025**

DEEPAK SAINI ALIAS VICKY

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Sushil Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant third petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 43 dated 12.02.2022 registered under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 201/34 of the IPC were added later on) at Police Station Badhra, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Briefly summarizing, the case of the prosecution is that the present FIR was registered on the statement of one Om Parkash son of Chander Bhan i.e. brother of the deceased, who was serving in Army. It has been averred that his deceased brother had come to the village on leave and was to report back on duty, however, on 03.02.2022, after dinner, all of them

**CRM-M-51364-2025**

-2-

went to sleep. He however felt dizziness in the morning and subsequently, he was taken to the General Hospital, Dadri where the Doctors declared him brought dead. The initial suspicion was of a cardiac arrest, however, it was later diagnosed that he had died as a result of asphyxia on account of smothering. The viscera was preserved for histopathological evaluation and toxicology analysis. On receipt of the said report, the instant FIR had been registered against the petitioner.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that similarly placed co-accused has been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 27.08.2025 passed in *CRM-M-46033-2025* titled as “*Manisha versus State of Haryana*”. He contends that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 03 years 06 months and 27 days. He submits that only 09 out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses have been examined and that conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute that the case of the petitioner would be identical to that of the co-accused Manisha.

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 period of actual custody being more than 03 years and 06 months, the stage of trial wherein only 09 out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take long time and I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.



CRM-M-51364-2025

-3-

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 17, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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