



114+242

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

**CRM-M No.58661 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 04.12.2025**

Vinay Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-48560-2025

Allowed as prayed for. Copy of final investigation
report/challan dated 02.09.2023 is ordered to be taken on record.

CRM-M-58661-2025

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.171, dated 06.07.2023, under Sections 302, 120-B, 34 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25(1)(a), 27, 54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sandeep, son



of Bheera Ram. It was alleged that younger brother of the complainant, namely, Manish Kumar, was elected as Sarpanch of the village in 2022. It was alleged that in the election of Sarpanch, Jangir, son of Jodha Ram, who is Uncle (Chacha) of Vinay (petitioner) also contested the election but he lost. On account of the same, they were nurturing the grudge against them. It was alleged that on 06.07.2023, at about 08:45 A.M., the complainant along with Dinesh and his brother, Manish Kumar (deceased) were sitting outside their house. In the meantime, Vinay (petitioner), Balkesh and Navdeep came there. Balkesh and Navdeep were armed with pistols and immediately on their arrival, they challenged Manish Kumar. Vinay (petitioner) encircled Manish Kumar from front side and Balkesh and Navdeep started firing at him with pistols, which they were holding in their hands. Manish Kumar tried to escape to save his life but Balkesh and Navdeep fired shots in the chest and back of Manish Kumar, due to which, he fell down. On firing bullets, all were escaped from the scene of occurrence. They shifted Manish Kumar to Civil Hospital, Uchana, however the doctors declared him dead. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 09.07.2023. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind, dismissed the bail application



filed by the petitioner vide order dated 30.01.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-11304-2025 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 19.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been roped in the present case because of the rivalry between the families on account of the Sarpanch elections in the village. He has submitted that it is an admitted fact that the complainant side had won the election whereas the uncle of the petitioner had lost the election. He has submitted that the whole family of the petitioner has been roped in the FIR only as an act of vendetta. He has submitted that as per the case of prosecution, the allegations against the petitioner that he encircled the deceased whereas he was fired upon by the co-accused. He has submitted that the petitioner is the brother of Balkesh, against whom, there are specific allegations of firing. He has submitted that because of the same, the petitioner has been implicated in the present case. He has submitted that in the challan filed, on the conclusion of the investigation, the basic findings against the petitioner is that he was one of the conspirators. He has submitted that the role attributed to the petitioner is different from that of the co-accused, who had fired upon the deceased. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a young boy and though he is prosecuted in one more FIR under the Atrocities Act, however he has been acquitted in the same. He



has submitted that the material witnesses already stand examined and thus, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner is not only specifically named in the FIR but he has actively participated in the murder of Manish Kumar. She has submitted that the petitioner is one of the prime conspirator, who is the nephew of Jangir, who lost the Panchayat election. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have been examined. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was named in the FIR whether the allegations against the petitioner that he encircled the deceased and the co-accused fired at the deceased. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 09.07.2023. The material witnesses, as submitted before this Court, already stand examined. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 04 months and 23 days as on 03.12.2025. As submitted before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is involved in one more case, however he has been acquitted in that case. Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have been examined so far.

7. The veracity of the allegations and counter allegations would



be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on parity.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.12.2025
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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