



CRM-M-11442-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-11442-2026
Date of decision: 18.04.2026

PRADEEP

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG, 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.79 dated 24.02.2023 registered under Sections 148/149/323/302/201/216/120-B/506 IPC and Section 25/29 of Arms Act at Police Station Sadar Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, Haryana.
2. Brief facts of the case of prosecution are that the petitioner along with co-accused has committed murder of the brother of the complainant. Hence the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that initially the petitioner was not attributed any injury with the firearm and he was stated to be armed with axe. He further submitted that even as per the medical evidence on record i.e. the post-mortem report of the deceased, the cause of death of deceased was multiple firearms injuries and no sharp-edged/blunt



weapon injuries were recorded. He further submits that the co-accused have been granted concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 13.09.2024. He further submits that the investigation in the present case is complete, charges framed, out of 34 prosecution witnesses 27 have been examined and 04 have been given up and only 03 are left to be examined. The trial will take a long time to conclude, hence, he prays that the present petition be allowed.

4. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate and status report in the matter, which are taken on record. He has opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He submits that the petitioner was having an axe in his hand at the time of alleged occurrence, however, when the deceased fell on the ground, the petitioner took the country made pistol from co-accused Sanjeet and fired a shot at the head of the deceased. He further submits that the trial is at the fag end and the prosecution witnesses have duly supported the case of the prosecution. To buttress his arguments, he has relied upon Annexure P-5 i.e. statement of Pawan, who has stated that the petitioner had took the pistol from Sujeet and fired towards head of the deceased. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature, involving the murder of the deceased. Though it has been argued that the petitioner was initially stated to be armed with an axe, however, the prosecution has specifically alleged, on the basis of the statement of Pawan, that during the occurrence the petitioner took the country-made pistol from



CRM-M-11442-2026

co-accused Sanjeet and fired at the head of the deceased. The said allegations are supported by the post-mortem report, which records multiple firearm injuries as the cause of death. The trial is already at the fag end, as only three prosecution witnesses remain to be examined. The petitioner is 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. In such circumstances, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

18.04.2026

Mohit Bishnoi

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No