



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-11349-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.04.2026

Jitender @ Anant

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rishikesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(through V.C.)

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-9105-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Main case:

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.214 dated 04.04.2023, registered under Section(s) 302 (Section 120-B added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Mujesar, District Faridabad.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, the present FIR was registered on the statement of Santosh Bhagat-father of deceased-Vishal, who was allegedly given injuries on the intervening night of 3/4.04.2023 at about 1.00 a.m. The complainant made a statement that he received a phone call from his wife that certain unknown persons had trespassed in their house and inflicted

serious injuries to their son with sharp edged weapon(s) and thereafter the assailants managed to flee from the place of occurrence.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, deceased-Vishal had an altercation with the petitioner and other co-accused including Neeraj, Ravi Kant Kumar, and Laltush @ Laltush Kumar. It is contended that the said co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail vide separate orders dated 21.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-20707-2024; dated 16.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-49617-2025 and dated 06.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-5897-2026. He submits that even though the case of the prosecution is that the mother and sister of deceased-Vishal were present in the house, however, they allegedly did not witness the incident in question. Besides, they have not even been cited as prosecution witnesses and the FIR has been registered on the statement of Santosh Bhagat. It is contended that the testimony of the complainant is nothing more than hearsay evidence. He contends that be that as it may, the petitioner was a juvenile on the date of the incident, but has been tried as an adult. He contends that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 03 years in the present case. He further submits that only 03 out of the total 33 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects, he, however, contends that the recovery of knife used in the commission of the crime has been effected from the house of the petitioner. The stage of the trial, the criminal antecedents, the age of the

petitioner on the date of the incident are not disputed by the learned State counsel

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the long incarceration of the petitioner coupled with the stage of trial where only 3 prosecution witnesses out of 33 have been examined so far and the fact that other 03 co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail vide separate orders passed by this Court, and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

21.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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