



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

120

CRM-M-67240-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 01.12.2025

Inderjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed for grant of interim bail for two weeks to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.29 dated 13.02.2023, registered under Sections 302, 120-B of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 34 and 201 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Baragudha, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has approached before this Court for grant of interim bail as mother of the petitioner is suffering from knee problem and doctor has advised her to operate/change of knee. It is further contended that the petitioner is the only son of his mother i.e. Smt. Manjeet Kaur, no other male member is present in the petitioner's house. Thus, learned counsel prayed for grant of interim bail to the petitioner.

3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-67240-2025 (O&M)

(2)

4. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner along with co-accused themselves have admitted the involvement in the occurrence and demarcated the place where they hatched conspiracy to kill Gulzar Singh. The motorcycle in question used in the commission of crime along with RC issued in the name of the present petitioner i.e. Inderjeet Singh, has also been recovered and taken into possession. It was specifically disclosed that the petitioner had fired a shot at Gulzar Singh while remaining two were sitting on the motorcycle.

5. Heard.

6. In case of heinous offence, ordinarily the Court must be slow to grant the concession of anticipatory bail in favour of accused. Hon'ble Apex Court in ***X v. State of Rajasthan & Anr. (2024 INSC 909)*** opined as under:

“14. Ordinarily in serious offences like rape, murder, dacoity, etc., once the trial commences and the prosecution starts examining its witnesses, the Court be it the Trial Court or the High Court should be loath in entertaining the bail application of the accused.

15. Over a period of time, we have noticed two things, i.e., (i) either bail is granted after the charge is framed and just before the victim is to be examined by the prosecution before the trial court, or (ii) bail is granted once the recording of the oral evidence of the victim is complete by looking into some discrepancies here or there in the deposition and thereby testing the credibility of the victim.



16. We are of the view that the aforesaid is not a correct practice that the Courts below should adopt. Once the trial commences, it should be allowed to reach to its final conclusion which may either result in the conviction of the accused or acquittal of the accused. The moment the High Court exercises its discretion in favour of the accused and orders release of the accused on bail by looking into the deposition of the victim, it will have its own impact on the pending trial when it comes to appreciating the oral evidence of the victim. It is only in the event if the trial gets unduly delayed and that too for no fault on the part of the accused, the Court may be justified in ordering his release on bail on the ground that right of the accused to have a speedy trial has been infringed."

7. Moreover, the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Asim Mallik versus State of Odisha [Special Leave Petition (Criminal) Diary No(s). 57403 of 2024; D/d.24.04.2025]** has cautioned that relief of interim bail should be extended only as an exception in special circumstances. The relevant extract of which is as under:-

"... 5. However, we have noticed in several such cases, which are coming to this Court challenging the orders passed by the Odisha High Court, that recurring interim bail is granted for the same applicant over and over again. Though, it may be necessary in some cases to grant interim bail to take care of specific contingencies, but as a routine, interim bail should not be granted. Either the Court should grant regular bail or should refuse to grant bail. Granting interim bail should be an exception, and should not be granted in a routine manner and repeatedly."



CRM-M-67240-2025 (O&M) (4)

8. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, and as regards the role of the present petitioner contended by learned State counsel and the fact that the offence in question, i.e. the offence of murder is a heinous one, this Court finds no merit in the present petition. As such, the same is dismissed.

01.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No