



CRM-M-59819-2024

-1-

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

218

**CRM-M-59819-2024
Date of Decision: 16.09.2025**

PARVEEN KUMAR**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ved Prakash, Sr. DAG, 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. 128 dated 06.04.2023 under Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 148,149,302,341,506 of IPC (Sections 120-B, 195-A IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak.
2. The case of the prosecution is that one Sumit @ Sethi was shot at by the co-accused. The petitioner has been implicated in this case on the basis of supplementary statement made by the complainant, Mohit. It is alleged that the petitioner gave information about Sumit @ Sethi to the co-accused and disclose his location form time to time prior to incident and on the basis of information supplied by the petitioner, the co-accused attacked on Sumit @

**CRM-M-59819-2024****-2-**

Sethi and killed him by firing shot. The petitioner was involved in criminal conspiracy.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR. He has no motive to commit murder of the deceased. No recovery has been effected from him. He further submits that the petitioner was not present at the spot and he has been nominated on the basis of supplementary statement made by the complainant. The petitioner is in custody since 22.05.2023.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner along with the co-accused, conspired to commit the murder of Sumit @ Sethi. He further submits that the challan was filed on 21.07.2023, charges were framed on 12.03.2025 and out of 36 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 02 years 02 months and 26 days.

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 for 02 years 02 months and 26 days; apart from the supplementary statement there is no evidence against the petitioner; the trial is moving at a snail's pace, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a



CRM-M-59819-2024

-3-

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.

16.09.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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