



CRA-S-3629-2024(O&M)

-1-

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

203(i)

CRA-S-3629-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.09.2025

RAVI KUMAR

... APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 09.10.2024 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad vide which the regular bail of the appellant has been dismissed in FIR No. 272 dated 16.06.2024 under Sections 302,307,506,34, 120-B, 212,202, 201 of IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act and Section 3(2) (v) Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 registered at Police Station City, Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the appellant was one of the conspirator and an active participant in the planning and execution of the murder. The name of the appellant came to light in the supplementary statement of the complainant Pooja, who identified him as one of the accused



involved in the killing of her husband. The said statement was recorded on the same very day when the FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has not been named in the FIR. Apart from supplementary statement there is no evidence against the appellant. No recovery of firearm or any vehicle has been effected from the appellant. He further submits that the appellant is in custody since 16.06.2024 and trial of the case may take quite some time, therefore, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the appellant in the custody any more.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the short reply by way of affidavit of Jagdish Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, Haryana and the same is taken on record. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposes the grant of regular bail to the appellant on the ground that the appellant has played an active role in the commission of offence. He further submits that out of 55 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the above submission of learned counsel and considering the custody period and the fact that trial is moving at a snail's pace as out of 55 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 witnesses have been examined so far, the continuous detention of the appellant would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, the rule is bail and rejection is exception, this Court deems it



a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the appellant during the pendency of the trial.

7. In view of the above impugned order dated 09.10.2024 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad is hereby set aside and appellant is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

01.09.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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