

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-4498-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

SAVTANTRA @ CHUNNU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Rahul Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, A.A.G., Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner-Savtantra @ Chunnu, aged 28 years, has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.935 dated 09.10.2023, registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 201 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

2. At the time of hearing, the primary contention of the petitioner's counsel is that the incident took place on 08.10.2023 at about 9.15 p.m. in front of the Office of one of the witness namely, Jaideep. As per the statement of Jaideep during investigation, due to the injuries given by the assailant(s) to Ranjan, who is son of complainant-Ram Karan, lost his life.

3. As per case of the prosecution in FIR, complainant-Ram Karan (father of the deceased-Ranjan) received a call by Arjun from Rubin (PW1) in regard to the incident that injuries have been given by the assailants to Rajan son of complainant. Thereupon, complainant Ram Karan reached to the hospital where his son Ranjan, in injured condition, disclosed to his

father that “3/4 days earlier, one Mohit @ Moni had quarrel with him and due to the grudge arising out of that quarrel, today Mohit @ Moni, along with his associates namely, Deepak @ Mirinda, Dheeraj, Deepak @ Popi and Savtantra @ Chunnu collectively assaulted him.” In his statement, deceased Ranjan specifically disclosed that Deepak @ Mirinda and Mohit @ Moni had inflicted knife blows to the deceased.

4. Rubin, on appearing before the Court as Prosecution Witness No.1, has not corroborated/supported the contention.

5. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner refers to the statement of witness-Jaideep, who also while appearing in the witness box as PW-4, did not support the case of the prosecution, rather stated that he on noticing that someone in front of his office has suffered injuries, he took him to the hospital. Deposition in examination-in-chief of witnesses (Rubin) is as under :-

“(Witness intends to depose in English)

Stated that on 08.10.2023 at about 8:30 to 9:00 PM I was there in the market of Samalkha for purchasing some household articles. When I was coming back from the market towards my rented room Adarsh Nagar and when I reached near Chiranji Hospital, Ranjan son of Ram Karan got hitted by some motor-cycle and there was scuffle between the rider of the motor-cycle and Ranjan. Then the assailants with their sharpened edged weapon caused injuries to Ranjan and all the three assailants fled away from the spot along-with their motor-cycle and with their weapons. The assailants were unknown persons and I cannot identify them. Some people picked up the injured and shifted him to the hospital at the stage. I informed about the incident to the family members of Ranjan.

At this stage, witness is suppressing the truth and requested that witness may be declared hostile. APP for the State wants to cross-examine the witness. Request heard and allowed.”

Deposition in examination-in-chief of witness-Jaideep (PW-4)

is as under :-

“(Witness intends to depose in English)

Stated that on 8.10.2023 I was present at my office. I heard a noise from outside when I came out from my office then I saw that a boy had sustained injury and blood was oozing out from his injuries. I shifted him in CHC Samalkha. Nothing else had happened in my present.

(At this stage, the Learned PP for the State, requested that the witness is suppressing the truth and resiled from his statement and he may be declared hostile. He further requested that he may be allowed to cross examine the witness).

Heard. Allowed.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that even if the allegations are taken to be correct upon its face value, no role has been assigned to the present petitioner of causing any injury or even being armed with any weapon at the spot. Two of the witnesses namely, Jaideep (PW-4) and Rubin (PW-1) have already turned hostile as they failed to support the prosecution version. He further argues that from the possession of petitioner-Savtantra @ Chunni, no weapon was recovered, nothing was recovered and after he being arrested, he is inside jail since 12.10.2023 and conclusion of trial may take some considerable time, therefore, prays for grant of bail.

7. Learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 25.02.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same

at appropriate place.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 01 year 02 months and 09 days period inside jail.

8. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant-Ms. Parul Saini, it is vehemently argued that in fact, the CDR details i.e. calls amongst all the accused itself shows that all of them had connived together to kill Ranjan, therefore, it won't be material if the petitioner was armed or unarmed. His involvement is very much clear from the facts and circumstances as he has been named by the complainant-Ram Karan in the FIR also.

9. I have considered the submissions addressed by all the respective counsel.

10. Admittedly, petitioner is inside jail since 12.10.2023. Petitioner is 28 years of age and in the present case, he has not been attributed any specific role by the deceased-Ranjan in his statement to his father-Ram Karan. As per deposition of the complainant, prime accused are Deepak @ Mirinda and Mohit @ Moni, who allegedly inflicted knife blows upon the deceased.

11. Except the name of the petitioner, no other specific role has been assigned to him in the FIR. However, involvement of petitioner inconnivance with the other accused, to eliminate deceased Ranjan is there or not, would definitely be a subject matter before the trial Court, requiring its adjudication at final stage, after adducing of complete evidence before it. Therefore, I do not find any strong reason to reject the plea of bail, finding no purpose of continuing him under detention till the completion of trial.

12. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

13. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

14. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

15. Petition stands disposed of.

March 10, 2026
gurpreet

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No