



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219-1

CRM-M-55435-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.10.2025

Bintu ...Petitioner(s)
VERSUS
State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

219-2

CRM-M-55436-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.10.2025

Arun ...Petitioner(s)
VERSUS
State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

108

CRM-M-61258-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.10.2025

Sandeep ...Petitioner(s)
VERSUS
State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner in CRM-M-55435-2025 and
CRM-M-55436-2025.

Mr. B.S. Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner(s) (through V.C.)
in CRM-M-61258-2024.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. All these three petitions, filed by different petitioner(s)-accused,



arising out of the same FIR, are being decided by this common order. For facility of reference facts are however being extracted from **CRM-M-55435-2025** titled as '**Bintu Vs. State of Haryana**'.

2. The instant petition has been filed for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.117 dated 02.02.2022, registered under Section(s) 302, 34, 394, 397, 459 (Section 412 added later on) and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Camp Palwal, District Palwal.

3. Briefly summarised, the facts of present case as mentioned in the trial Court's order dated 21.07.2025 reads thus:-

“2. Tersely put, the factual background of the case of the prosecution is that on February 2, 2022, Priya Srivastava, a resident of RBI/39C East Railway Colony, Palwal, left her home for work at around 8:00 AM, as she did every day. Priya, who worked as an Assistant in the Railway Signal Department in Old Faridabad, left her three children, Pragya (6 years), Vanya (2 years) and Saransh (1 year) in the care of her 62-year-old mother, Meera Devi. At approximately 9:30 PM, Priya received a phone call from her neighbour Jitender informing her that something had hapened to her mother at home. Alarmed, Priya tried calling her mother, but received no response. She then contacted her neighbour Suman Devi, who informed her that her mother had been murdered and the house had been robbed, with jewelry and other valuables stolen. Upon reaching home, Priya learned the details from her daughter



Pragya. Three unknown young men, armed with weapons, had entered the house through the back door. They tied up the children and Priya's mother before brutally murdering Meera Devi during the robbery. Pragya managed to reach the front door by sliding across the floor, where she was seen by her uncle Kishanpal Meena, who lived nearby. Kishanpal untied Pragya's hands, feet and mouth, after which the neighbours quickly informed the Police Control Room via 112. The police, led by SI Preetam and supported by ASI Dharampal, HC Laxman Singh, HC Pawan Kumar and others, arrived at the scene. The Mahila Police Station SHO, PSI Surekha and an FSL team headed by Dr. Vinod Kumar were also notified and arrived to investigate. Priya submitted a written statement, confirming the robbery and her mother's murder. Based on the evidence and statements gathered at the scene, a case was registered under Sections 394, 397, 459, 302, and 34 IPC along with the Arms Act (25-54-59)."

4. Reply filed by way of affidavit dated 26.03.2025 in CRM-M-61258-2024 on behalf of respondent-State is already available on file and the same is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State informs that all the petitioners are involved in multiple cases of such and similar nature and the trial is not being unduly delayed. She submits that out of 23 prosecution witnesses, 10 have already been examined. She further contends that the



219 CRM-M-55435-2025 (O&M) and connected cases

prosecution shall ensure that the evidence is concluded expeditiously in any case within a period of 06 months from the date next fixed for recording of evidence.

6. Taking into consideration the custody already undergone by the petitioners respectively as also the nature of allegations against the petitioners who are alleged to have smothered Meera Devi, aged 62 years, to death by asphyxia, while also tying up the minor children before committing a robbery and decanting with valuable articles from the house, which such articles were recovered from the petitioners, counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-61258-2024 titled as ‘Sandeep Vs. State of Haryana’ does not press the petition at this stage and seeks withdrawal thereof.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-55435-2025 and CRM-M-55436-2025 titled as ‘Bintu Vs. State of Haryana’ and ‘Arun Vs. State of Haryana’ respectively contends that he has no instructions to withdraw or to not press the petitions.

8. Be that as it may, I deem it fit to **dispose of** petitions bearing Nos. CRM-M-55435-2025 and CRM-M-55436-2025 at this stage with a direction to the trial Court to make every endeavour to expeditiously conclude the evidence within a period of 06 months from the date next fixed before it for recording of the prosecution evidence.

9. All pending misc. application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.10.2025
Mangal Singh

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