



CRM-M-59377-2024

-1-

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

219(i)

CRM-M-59377-2024

Date of Decision: 22.09.2025

SAGAR

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No. 460 dated 28.10.2023 under Section 346 of IPC (later on Section 346 was deleted and Sections 302,201,34 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 was added) registered at Police Station Israna, District Panipat.
2. The case of the prosecution is that a missing report was filed by a woman named Poonam, wife of Jitender to the effect that her husband Jitender had left the house without any intimation and he had not returned. Thereafter on 05.11.2023, on the basis of supplementary statement made by Sagar, cousin brother of the complainant, the present petitioner had been implicated in the present case. It is alleged that the petitioner along with co-accused committed the murder of the deceased-Jitender by strangulating him and stabbing him with

**CRM-M-59377-2024****-2-**

a knife in his stomach and chest. Thereafter, they had thrown the dead body of deceased in the canal with an intention to screen themselves from legal punishment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the basis of the supplementary statement of the cousin of the petitioner, the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused. He further submits that the supplementary statement has been recorded after a delay of 12 days, so it is clear that the same is an afterthought.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that motorcycle and knife used in the commission of crime were recovered from the house of the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate dated 18.09.2025 of the petitioner in the Court today and the same is taken on record. As per which, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 years 10 months and 09 days. He further submits that out of 23 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 have been examined so far and petitioner is not involved in any other case.

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

6. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for more than 01 years 10 months and 09 days; out of 23 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 have been examined so far, the petitioner is not involved in any other case, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, this Court deems



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

7. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

22.09.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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