



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

233

CRM-M-52822-2025

Date of Decision : 23.09.2025

SAHUD @ SAHOOD @ SHAHUD

.... PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

.... RESPONDENT

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present : Mr.Sunil Panwar, Advocate
Mr. Dhruv Singh, Advocate
Mr. Varun Suman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.61 dated 13.04.2024, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 302, 506, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Pinangwan, District Nuh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the prosecution witnesses examined as PW-1 to PW-7 have not supported the case of prosecution and except these witnesses, there is no independent witness who support the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that only the formal witnesses i.e. medical and police officials are yet to be examined in this case. The co-accused namely Iqbal @ Iqbal Khan has already been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-18379-2025 vide order date 20.08.2025. The present petitioner is in custody since 15.04.2024 i.e. more than one year and five months. He is not involved in any other criminal activity and ready to present before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing.



3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and admitted that the material witnesses have already been examined in this case and they have not supported the case of prosecution. However, learned State counsel opposed the bail application by submitting that the weapon of offence, i.e. an iron rod, has been recovered from the accused, which was allegedly used to inflict injuries on the head of the complainant

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the fact that independent witnesses have already been examined in this case and they have not supported the case of prosecution; only formal witnesses are yet to be examined; the present petitioner is in custody for the last one year and five months; trial will take time to conclude; there is no material on the file which suggest that after release, the petitioner will tamper with prosecution evidence or flee away from process of law; this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

23.09.2025

Anju

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