



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

Sr. No.221

CRM-M-12934-2026
Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

SATYAPRIYE

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 7 dated 07.01.2020, registered at Police Station Udyog Vihar, District Gurugram under Section 346 IPC, 1860, and later on Sections 201, 302 and 34 IPC, 1860 were added, though Section 346 IPC was deleted in the challan dated 14.04.2025.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 07.01.2020, complainant Naresh submitted a complaint stating that his mother, aged about 50 years, had gone missing from the house on 06.01.2020 and had not returned thereafter. Despite efforts made by the family to search for her, she could not be traced and her mobile phone was also found switched off. On the basis of the said complaint, initially an FIR under Section 346 IPC was registered. During investigation, as no clue regarding the missing person or any offence could be found, an untraced report was submitted before the



Court on 05.02.2021. However, subsequently, during investigation of another case bearing FIR No. 13 of 2021 under Sections 302/201/34 IPC at Police Station Manesar, accused Sushma and Satish made disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the present case. On the basis of these disclosure statements, Sections 302/201/34 IPC were added in the present case and the petitioner was arrested. The prosecution case further alleges that the petitioner, along with co-accused, committed the murder of Laxmi Devi and thereafter disposed of her dead body by throwing the same into the Ganges canal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is mainly contended that the dead body in the present case has not been recovered till date and in the absence thereof, the allegation of murder cannot be conclusively established. It is further submitted that the entire case of the prosecution rests upon the disclosure statements of co-accused Sushma and Satish, which have no substantive evidentiary value, especially when no recovery has been effected pursuant to such disclosure. It is argued that the case is purely based on circumstantial evidence and the chain of circumstances is incomplete, as there is no last seen evidence against the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that as per the CDR and location of the petitioner, he was not present at the place of occurrence on the alleged date. It is also contended that the petitioner is in custody and the trial is likely to take considerable time. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the sole bread earner of his family and has family responsibilities to discharge. It is also argued that there are no chances of the



petitioner absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence and he undertakes to abide by all the conditions imposed by the Court.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner, in connivance with co-accused, hatched a conspiracy to commit the murder of Laxmi Devi on account of monetary dispute. It is submitted that the deceased had advanced a loan to co-accused Sushma and upon demand of repayment, the petitioner along with co-accused planned and executed the murder. It is further submitted that the deceased was administered intoxicating substance and thereafter strangled and her body was disposed of in the Ganga canal. It is argued that the involvement of the petitioner has surfaced during investigation on the basis of disclosure statements and other material collected. It is also contended that the trial is at an initial stage, the prosecution evidence is yet to commence and there is every likelihood that the petitioner may influence or intimidate the prosecution witnesses if released on bail. Thus, it is prayed that the present petition be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and pertain to an offence punishable under Sections 302, 201 and 34 IPC. Though the case is based on circumstantial evidence, the material witnesses in the present case are yet to be examined and admittedly, not even a single witness has been examined so far. Charges have already been framed and the trial has commenced. The custody of the petitioner is only about 11 months and at this stage, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is every



possibility of the petitioner influencing or tampering with the prosecution witnesses, if enlarged on bail.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegations, the nature of evidence and the stage of trial, no ground is made out for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

7. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

06.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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