



CRM-M-51688 of 2025

-1-

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

238

CRM-M-51688 of 2025
Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

Mohd. Aadil

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.413 dated 20.10.2024 registered under Sections 115, 190, 191(2) and 117(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 103(1) and 3(5) of BNS added later on), at Police Station Chand Hut, District Palwal.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused murdered one Bhojraj (son of the complainant), due to some altercation between them.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argues that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any concern with the alleged offence.

**CRM-M-51688 of 2025****-2-**

He further argues that the petitioner was nominated in the case only on the basis of suspicion that too in the supplementary statement made by the complainant before the police on 24.10.2024 i.e. after a delay of 04 days of registration of the FIR. He further argues that complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and have been declared hostile. To lend force to his contention, he has drawn the attention of this Court to the statement of the complainant-Mool Chand (Annexure P-9), statement of eye-witness Khusi (Annexure P-2), eye-witness Rabia @ Noormila Begum (Annexure P-3), eye-witness Jyoti @ Pooja (Annexure P-4), eye-witness Ajit (Annexure P-5), eye-witness Khem Chand (Annexure P-6), eye-witness Nishant (Annexure P-7) and eye-witness Sahil (Annexure P-8), respectively, made before the trial Court wherein none of them have supported the case of the prosecution and have not identified the petitioner to be the person who murdered the deceased-Bhojraj. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 27.10.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 35 prosecution witnesses and out of them, only 11 have been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting



CRM-M-51688 of 2025

-3-

that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He argues that the petitioner was involved in the heinous crime of murder of Bhojraj (son of the complainant) and has actively participated in the crime. He further argues that the complainant disclosed the name of the petitioner in his supplementary statement, and as such, there is specific role and allegation against the petitioner. However, he has not controverted the fact that the complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and are declared hostile and that the petitioner is first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 01 month; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and declared hostile, out of 35 witnesses, only 11 have been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of

**CRM-M-51688 of 2025****-4-**

India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

02.12.2025*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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