



CRM-M-16255-2026

-1-

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

216

CRM-M-16255-2026

Date of decision : 07.04.2026

**SANDEEP RAWAT @ SAINDY**

... PETITIONER

VS.

**STATE OF HARYANA**

... RESPONDENT

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate,  
Mr. Akash Godara, Advocate and  
Ms. Isha Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. S.K. Garg Narwana, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate,  
Mr. Mukul Ahuja, Advocate and  
Ms. Sukriti Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail in case FIR No.319 dated 01.07.2024, under Sections 302, 34, 114 & 120-B IPC (now Sections 103, 3(5), 54, 61(2) of BNS, 2023) and Sections 27/54/59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dabua, Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that co-accused Vijay Singh on the instigation of the petitioner and other co-accused, is alleged to have fired a shot at the chest of one Kunal Bhadana, which resulted in his death. It is alleged that the petitioner caught hold the hands of the eye-witness, namely, Inder

**CRM-M-16255-2026****-2-**

during the scuffle. It is also alleged that due to enmity, co-accused Vijay Kumar committed the murder of Kunal.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case while he had no grudge with the deceased. Moreover, the CCTV footage indicates that it is a case of sudden fight without any pre-meditation and the complainant was the aggressor party. Learned Senior counsel further submits that neither any overt act has been attributed to the petitioner nor any recovery has been recovered from him. The petitioner was merely present at the place of occurrence. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 08 months and 28 days and is not involved in any other case. It is also submitted that co-accused Virender Singh @ Billu has already been granted by this Court in CRM-M-4541-2026 on 02.02.2026. He has referred to a copy of the order in this regard at Annexure P-10. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time because only 04 out of 38 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and none of them, in their depositions, have attributed any specific role to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 08 months and 28 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only 04 out of 38 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.



CRM-M-16255-2026

-3-

5. On the other hand, learned Senior counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.
6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 08 months and 28 days, he is not involved in any other case, no specific role has been attributed to him, co-accused has already been granted bail and that the trial is likely to take a long time as only 04 out of 38 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.
8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.
9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 07, 2026  
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)  
JUDGE

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