



261

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

**CRM-M No.63494 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.11.2025**

Sachin

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Najar Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-45178-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-63494-2025

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.102, dated 28.03.2024, under Sections 302, 201 IPC (Section 34 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Bahalgarh, District Sonipat.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Vikas son of Vinod Kumar. It was alleged that about a year back, the complainant



worked in commando security, where Imran Ali had come to commando security in search of work. It was alleged that during that time, he got acquainted with him and thereafter, he left the job and started his own security company in Bahalgarh. It was alleged that Imran Ali started visiting him and on 27.03.2024, at about 9:00 P.M., the complainant talked to Imran Ali on his phone and asked him to come to his office. On 28.03.2024, at about 07:00 A.M. in the morning, the complainant went to Sector 7, Devi Lal Park for a walk. In the crowd, he found a boy lying dead and was badly injured. On seeing from close, he realized that it was dead body of Imran Ali. He was badly hit by bricks and stones. The request was made to take legal action against the unknown persons, who killed Imran Ali. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the police recorded the statement of Dev Kumar on 28.03.2024 itself, wherein he deposed that he saw Deepak and his friends, who had killed Imran Ali and thus, Dev Kumar was cited as an eye-witness. On the basis of his statement, the investigation was further carried out and complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 14.04.2024. On completion of investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 25.09.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the



present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the FIR has been registered against some unknown person, thus, it is evident that neither the petitioner has been named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him. However, after registration of the FIR, the statement of Dev Kumar was recorded, wherein he mentioned about Deepak and his friends. He has submitted that even in his statement recorded on 28.03.2024, the petitioner was not named but later on the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused to be the person with Deepak, who allegedly killed Imran Ali. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that this eye-witness, namely, Dev Kumar has been examined before the learned trial Court as PW-8, however he has not supported the case of prosecution. He had specifically deposed before the Court that he did not know anything about the present case and no murder was committed by the accused person in his presence, thus, he was declared hostile. He has submitted that once the eye-witness in itself does not support the case of prosecution, false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 1½ years and the material witnesses already stand examined. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that during the investigation, complicity of the petitioner



has been prima facie established. She has submitted that the eye-witness has seen the petitioner having committed the murder along with Deepak. However, she does not controvert the fact that the eye-witness, namely, Dev Kumar has not supported the case of prosecution. She, on instructions from ASI Subhash Chander, has submitted that out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR was lodged against the unknown persons, however the petitioner was named by the alleged eye-witness, namely, Dev Kumar. The said eye-witness has been examined before the learned trial Court and he has not supported the case of prosecution. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 14.04.2024. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 07 months and 01 day as on 14.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of 21 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined as on date.

8. The veracity of the 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned

counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

10. 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.

17.11.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE