



CRM-M-9138 of 2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-9138 of 2025
Date of Decision: 06.02.2026

Somit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Narender Kumar Rana, 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.194 dated 02.06.2021 registered under Sections 302, 201, 397 and 34 of the IPC, at Police Station Sadar Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.
2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the petitioner along with other co-accused committed murder of one Devi Singh (father of the complainant).
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any concern with the said offence and initially, the FIR was registered against unknown persons. He further argued

**CRM-M-9138 of 2025****-2-**

that there is no eye-witness of the alleged incident and entire case is based on hearsay and circumstantial evidence. He further argued that the petitioner was neither connected with the deceased nor met him before, does there is no motive for the petitioner to murder him. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 04.06.2021. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits 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 had committed the murder of the deceased by hitting iron rod in his head. She further argued that the motor-cycle and mobile phone of the deceased were recovered from the petitioner. She further argued that iron rod used in the crime was also recovered from the petitioner and as per the FSL report, the blood of the deceased matches with the clothes of the petitioner, which he was wearing at the time of committing the offence. Hence, she prays that the present petition be dismissed.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature as he along with co-accused has



CRM-M-9138 of 2025

-3-

committed heinous murder of the deceased. The motor-cycle and mobile of the deceased had been recovered from the petitioner. The recovery of weapon of offence and the FSL report affirms the role of the petitioner in the alleged crime. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. 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 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).

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, recovery of motor-cycle and mobile phone of the deceased-Devi Singh from 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

06.02.2026
D.Bansal

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