



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

218

CRM-M-10493-2025

Date of decision: 13.01.2026

UAJJWAL @ UJJVAL @ UJJWAL

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Present: Ms. Apoorva Arya, Advocate &  
Mr. J.S. Ghumman, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rishi Lal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.**

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 120-B, 147, 148, 149, 302, 307 of Indian Penal Code, hereinafter being referred to as 'IPC' and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 [Sections 285 read with Section 120-B IPC, 1860 and Section 25(1-B)(A) of Arms Act, 1959 added later on], the FIR No.367 dated 03.09.2020, has been lodged in Police Station Pataudi, District Gurugram. With regard to commission of above-mentioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested. He is in custody, and therefore, craving for the concession of bail. This is third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under



Section 483 of BNSS.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the complaint of Jai Bhagwan, hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 02.09.2020 at about 10:00 PM he alongwith his cousin was walking on a road leading to Khandewla turn in village Jatauli. According to complainant, there his another cousin namely Inderjeet alongwith two other persons, namely Vishal and Vikram, came in a Swift car, but the passage was blocked due to cows sitting in the middle of the road. As per complainant, when they were in the process of removing the cows from the road, the petitioner and his co-accused came on motorcycle and resorted to indiscriminate firing of gun shots and fled towards Khandewla side. It was also stated by the complainant that in the above-mentioned incident Inderjeet, Vishal and Vikram suffered injuries, who were admitted in hospital.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation the petitioner was arrested.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the valuable right of speedy trial, available to the petitioner, is being denied in the present case as he is in custody for a period of more than five years and the trial has not been concluded. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that even there is no chance of conclusion of trial in near future. As per learned counsel



for the petitioner as per settled principles of law, the petitioner should not be kept in custody for a long time due to delay in trial, and therefore, due to delay in trial, the petitioner has got a right to seek bail. According to learned counsel for the petitioner otherwise also the benefit of bail has been accorded to the co-accused and therefore, on the ground of parity also, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail. The learned counsel for the petitioner on the above-mentioned grounds has contended that the present petition which is third petition for bail, is maintainable.

6. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. It has been contended by learned State counsel that in the present case from the date of dismissal of former petition for bail, moved by the petitioner, no significant change in circumstance has taken place and therefore, the present petition for bail is not maintainable.

7. In addition to above, the learned State counsel has also argued that the petitioner has a very long criminal history and he has been prosecuted in seven other criminal cases also. According to learned State counsel all the above-mentioned cases pertains to serious offences. It has also been submitted by learned State counsel that the trial is taking place at a reasonable pace as out of 52, 33 witnesses have already been examined.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that as per custody certificate submitted by learned State counsel, the petitioner in this case is in custody for a period of more than 05 years and 02 months. However, the record shows that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, there is no significant change in circumstances pertaining to the case of the petitioner.



10. In addition to above, it is also relevant to mention here that in addition to present case, the custody certificate shows that the petitioner is facing prosecution in following cases,-

| Sr. No. | FIR Number | Under Sections                                                 | Police Station            |
|---------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1       | 137/2018   | 147, 148, 149, 307, 352, 452, 511, 323 IPC & Section 7 CLA Act | Aurangabad, Bulandshahar  |
| 2.      | 187/2018   | 25 Arms Act                                                    | AAurangabad, Bulandshahar |
| 3.      | 45/2019    | 363, 366-A IPC                                                 | Aurangabad, Bulandshahar  |
| 4.      | 3121/2018  | 148, 149, 307, 452 IPC and 5 POCSO Act                         | Aurangabad, Bulandshahar  |
| 5.      | 469/2020   | 379 & 411 IPC                                                  | Dadri, Gautam Budh Nagar  |
| 6.      | 329/2020   | 379 & 411 IPC                                                  | Beta-2, Gautam Budh Nagar |
| 7.      | 169/2018   | 307 IPC                                                        | Bulandshahar              |

11. A perusal of record shows that the petitioner has a very long criminal history and large number of cases for which the petitioner is being prosecuted, comes within the ambit of heinous crime.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of both the above-mentioned factors, in my considered opinion this petition for bail moved by the petitioner has got no merit and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

13. However before parting ways with this order, it shall be appropriate to take notice of the fact that the petitioner in this case is in custody and already more than 05 years have past. Thus, in the given facts situation it shall be appropriate that a direction is given to the learned trial



Court to conclude the trial in a time bound manner.

14. Hence, the learned trial Court is hereby directed to conclude the trial and pass the final verdict within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of instant order. The copy of this order be forwarded to the learned trial Court forthwith through appropriate channel.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)  
JUDGE

13.01.2026  
*vipin*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |