



CRM-M-17292-2026

-1-

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

221

CRM-M-17292-2026

Date of decision : 07.04.2026

VINOD @ KD SAROHA

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Nirmal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, A.A.G., Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (corresponding Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in case FIR No.201 dated 16.09.2024, under Sections 103(1), 238(b), 3(5), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 (corresponding Sections 302, 201, 34 & 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Safidon, District Jind.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.09.2024, two skeletons wrapped in a cloth were found in the bathroom on the ground floor of the house. The FSL team was called at the spot and upon inspection, two skeletons of a female and a child were recovered. Thereafter, the statement of Sunil @ Monu was recorded wherein he stated that his cousin brother, namely, Deepak had constructed a house around 7 years ago and he used to take care of the said house. It is also stated that on 10/11.08.2024, one Mandeep Malik @ Sonu, resident of Rohtak along with his wife and a child aged about 5-6 years came to him on a Splendor motorcycle and asked for accommodation on rent. He gave



CRM-M-17292-2026

-2-

first floor on rent and the ground floor was lying vacant. On 14.08.2024, Mandeep informed him that he was going to Rohtak to collect his documents and thereafter, his phone was switched off. The neighbours told him that there was a dispute between Mandeep and his wife. Therefore, a suspicion arose that Mandeep Malik had brutally killed his wife and child and hid their dead bodies. However, on 18.09.2024, one Ajay and his wife Pinki were arrested and during interrogation, they suffered disclosure statement admitting that they committed the murder of Komal and her son Aarav. It is further disclosed that the motorcycle used for the alleged offence owned by the present petitioner, who is cousin of co-accused Ajay.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Besides the disclosure statement, there is no incriminating material which would connect him with the alleged offence. It is submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are vague, particularly with regard to the alleged use of the motorcycle for taking the deceased to a rented accommodation. Neither any overt act nor any motive has been attributed to the petitioner. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 06 months and 16 days and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time because only 01 out of 42 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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



CRM-M-17292-2026

-3-

petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 06 months and 16 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only 01 out of 42 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. 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, 06 months and 16 days, he is not involved in any other case and that the trial is likely to take a long time as only 01 out of 42 cited prosecution witnesses has 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.

7. 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.

8. 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