

2025:PHHC:152349



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

CRM-M-55678-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 04.11.2025

Pronounced on : 07.11.2025

Deepak

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. CRM-43729-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Documents are taken on record as Annexures P-6 and P-7.

2. Main Case

The petitioner is seeking indulgence of this Court for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 637 dated 27.07.2020, registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 302, 341 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat on the basis of a complaint submitted by complainant Pritam Singh alleging that in the morning of 27.07.2020, on receipt of an information regarding dead body of his nephew Manpreet @ Sonu lying in the street of Tau Devi Lal Complex, he had reached there and found that the victim had sustained injury on his head. He alleged that he had made inquiries and came to know that on the previous night, accused Anil, Ashu, Vicky and Suraj had an altercation with the victim. They had

2025:PHHC:152349



called the petitioner and other accused at the spot and all of them had opened an attack upon the victim by striking blows with lathis, sticks etc. and had caused his homicidal death. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body and the inquest proceedings were conducted. Statements of some material witnesses were recorded. On 29.07.2020, the complainant produced a DVD containing a video, wherein four persons were seen while inflicting injuries upon the victim. Accused Ashu @ Sahil, Anil @ Nilu, Sunny @ Mota and Ashok @ Sheru were arrested on that date. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in this case and also took names of petitioner and as assailant. The petitioner was arrested on 07.08.2020.

3. The petitioner had been granted concession of regular bail, vide order dated 23.02.2021 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-43278-2020**. However, he absented himself on 01.11.2021, due to which, his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Ultimately, proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. were initiated against him and he was declared a proclaimed offender on 23.12.2022. He was arrested again on 16.09.2024.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is now in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His absence was not intentional. He had remained in custody in a case bearing FIR No. 693 dated 20.10.2021 and hence could not appear before the trial Court in this case. He is ready to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed by this Court for grant of bail. No specific overt act or injury to the victim or any other injured has been attributed to him. In the past also, he had been granted concession of bail during trial. It is, therefore, urged that

2025:PHHC:152349



the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be granted concession of regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner coupled with the fact that he was declared a proclaimed offender and that there are chances of his absconding again, if released on bail, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions made by both the sides.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object of that unlawful assembly, is alleged to have caused injuries to the victim, which resulted in his homicidal death. However, no specific injury had been attributed to him. He was extended benefit of bail. Now, he is in custody since 16.09.2024. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as only 04 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far out of total 35 witnesses. His continued detention is not going to serve any fruitful purpose. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that this petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner

2025:PHHC:152349



- whatsoever.
- (ii) he shall deposit his passport, if any, with the learned trial Court and shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
 - (iii) he shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when directed.
 - (iv) he shall provide his address where he would be residing after release and shall not change the same without informing the concerned IO/SHO.
 - (v) the petitioner shall upon his release give his mobile phone number to concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switch on all times.

8. In the event of there being any FIR/complaint lodged against the petitioner, it shall be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.
9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

07.11.2025
Wassem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>