



CRM-M-7926 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-7926 of 2026
Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Arjun Sahani

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Parveen Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi. DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.396 dated 25.11.2022 registered under Section 302 of IPC, at Police Station Sector-6 Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner has committed murder of his wife-Jibchi Devi. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case only because the reason that he is the husband of the deceased. He further submitted that the petitioner is not physically fit and was diagnosed with Hernia while in jail. He argued that the petitioner was roped in the FIR only on the basis of suspicion without any concrete evidence. He argued that there is no eye-

**CRM-M-7926 of 2026****-2-**

witness of the alleged incident and entire case is based on hearsay and circumstantial evidence. The petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record and while referring to the status report already filed in the matter, she has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR and he is involved in the heinous crime of murder of his wife. She further argued that the petitioner is being provided proper and adequate medical treatment in judicial custody and there is no medical ground warranting his release for treatment from any private hospital. Hence, she prays that the present petition be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner has committed the murder of his wife and as such, he has actively participated in the crime. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody and his medical condition. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period



CRM-M-7926 of 2026 -3-

of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra*, (2007) 1 SCC 242 and *State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi*, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC). This Court has also considered the submission of the petitioner qua his medical condition but as per the State reply, proper and adequate medical treatment has been provided to the petitioner in judicial custody and there is no medical ground warranting his release.

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, coupled with the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Accordingly, the present petition being bereft of any merit, is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
D.Bansal

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