



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

218

**CRM-M-7436-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON : 12.03.2026**

Sube Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. H.N Sahu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.(Oral)

This petition for bail is the second petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.541 dated 17.10.2018, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 307, 386, 34 of Indian Penal Code (Challan presented under Sections 307, 386, 420, 468, 471, 120-B and 34 of IPC, 2023), Police Station City Model Town, District Rewari.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of Dr. S.K. Sharma, who reported to the police that on 16.10.2018 at about 07:14 P.M., an incident of firing had taken place at Pushpanjali Hospital near Rajesh Pilot Chowk, Rewari, and that details of shooters were captured in the CCTV camera.



3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned information, formal FIR of this case was lodged and further investigation taken up.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner as well as status report. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that in the present case, the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration, as he has been in custody for a period of more than four years and nine months, and that the trial is taking place at a very slow pace as out of forty four prosecution witnesses, not even a single witness has been examined so far. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, similarly placed co-accused has already been enlarged on bail and therefore, on the ground of parity also, the petitioner is entitled for benefit of bail.

8. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, in the present case the delay in trial cannot be attributed to the prosecution. Rather it is attributable to the accused, because as and when the witnesses appeared before the learned trial Court, one of the accused, namely 'Gaurav Rathi @Chintu', had been found absent. As per learned State Counsel in such a



manner the accused themselves are delaying the disposal of the abovementioned trial.

9. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that the petitioner has a very long criminal history, as he has been facing prosecution in more than 30 cases, including several cases under Section 302 of IPC and several cases of extortion. It has also been pointed out by learned State Counsel that on three occasions in three different cases, the petitioner had misused the concession of bail, and that he was declared proclaimed offender in those cases. According to learned State Counsel the past conduct of the petitioner shows that, if released on bail, there are very fair chances that either the petitioner will not participate in the trial, or he will threaten the witnesses.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. A perusal of record shows that in the present case the custody certificate placed on record by the learned State Counsel contains the list of cases pending against the petitioner. The abovementioned list is as under:-

- i. FIR No.273/2025, dated 16.07.2025 under Sections 111(3) BNS, 308(5) BNS, 351(3) BNS, PS Bilaspur, Gurugram.
- ii. FIR No.1429/2020, dated 20.12.2020 under Section 174-A of IPC, PS Shivaji Nagar, Gurugram.
- iii. FIR No.206/2019, dated 31.05.2019 under Sections 294, 386 and 506 of IPC, PS Kherki Daula, Gurugram.
- iv. FIR No.340/2016, dated 22.09.2016 under Section 120-B, 216, 302 of IPC, 27(A) A. Act, PS Sector 40, Gurugram.



- v. FIR No.162/2017, dated 16.07.2017 under Sections 120-B, 148, 149, 201 of IPC, 25/54/59 A. Act, 302, 380, 420 of IPC, PS Bawal, Rewari (PWR).
- vi. FIR No.150/2020, dated 08.06.2020 under Sections 120-B, 148, 149, 201, 302, 316, 420, 467/468/471, 114, 109 of IPC 25/54/59 A. Act, PS Kasola, Rewari.
- vii. FIR No.88/2018, dated 12.08.2018 under Sections 120-B, 201, 302, 34, 420, 109, 114 of IPC and 25/54/59 A. Act, PS Rohrai, Rewari.
- viii. FIR No.214/2020, dated 09.03.2020 under Sections 120-B, 201, 307 and 506 of IPC, 25/54/59 A. Act, PS Model Town, Rewari.
- ix. FIR No.421/2020, dated 10.07.2020 under Sections 120-B, 307, 386 and 201 of IPC, PS Model Town, Rewari.
- x. FIR No.270/2019, dated 01.11.2019 under Sections 120-B, 398/401 of IPC, 25/54/59 A. Act, PS Bawal, Rewari.
- xi. FIR No.74/2019, dated 13.03.2019 under Sections 387, 506 and 384 of IPC, PS Sushant Lok, Gurugram (PWR).
- xii. FIR No.341/2019, dated N/A under Sections 201, 302, 34 and 341 of IPC, 25/54/59 A. Act, PS Hathin, Palwal.
- xiii. FIR No.298/2018, dated N/A under Sections 120-B, 201 and 506 of IPC, PS Manesar, Gurugram.
- xiv. FIR No.95/2021, dated N/A under Section 25-29-54-59 A. Act, PS SPL. Cell, NA (PWR).
- xv. FIR No.150/2020, dated N/A under Sections 147, 148, 149 of IPC, 302 BNS, 307 IPC, 450 IPC, 201/120-B IPC, 3/25 A. Act, 5/27 A. Act, PS Kot Kasim, Alwar.

xvi. FIR No.195/2025, dated 28.07.2025 under Section 25(1-B)(A) Act, PS DLF PH-I Gurgaon, Gurugram (Next date of hearing fixed for 16.03.2026).

12. The abovementioned details of cases which are pending against the petitioner shows that petitioner is a person who has misused the concession of bail to the maximum possible limit on three occasions, when he was declared proclaimed offender. That is why three different FIRs under Section 174-A IPC were slapped against him.

13. It is also pertinent to mention here that the abovementioned details also shows that the multiple cases are pending against the accused for murder, attempt to commit murder and extortion. In these circumstances, it is apparent that if the petitioner is released on bail he will definitely exercise his liberty to intimidate the witnesses.

14. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, it is hereby observed that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail, and the present petition deserves dismissal. The same is hereby *dismissed*, accordingly.

15. However, it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

16. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

12.03.2026
Vinod

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