

CRM-M-20412-2026 (O & M) 2026:PHHC:082640



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(215)

CRM-M-20412-2026 (O & M)
Date of decision:25.05.2026

Nidhi

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Parveen, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anirudh Kaushal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

CRM-23316-2026

The application for placing on record the copy of supplementary challan dated 31.08.2024 as Annexure A-1, is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions. The same is taken on record.

CRM-M-20412-2026

The prayer in this second petition under Section 439(1) Cr.P.C./Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the interim regular bail for 60 days to the petitioner in FIR No.835 dated 15.12.2021 under Sections 302, 449, 506, 120B IPC (Sections 103(1), 332, 351, 61 of BNS) and Section 25, 27 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat.



::2::

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Virendra Kumar and reads as under:-

In service, SHO Saheb Police Station City Panipat, My Submission is that I am Virendra Kumar S/o Shri Desraj, resident of 450/1 Near Paramhans Kutia, Panipat. I have a grocery shop near Paramhans hut. My nephew named Vinod Kumar son of Shri Surendra Kumar was a resident of 451/1 near Paramhans Kutia Panipat. My nephew Vinod Kumar used to run a Hartron computer centre in Sukhdev Nagar, Panipat. As on dated 05.10.2021 in the evening time, my nephew Vinod was sitting at the gate of the Paramhans hut and on the same day When I was standing outside my shop, the driver of car No. PB 03 BG 8833 hit my nephew Vinod directly. There was an Accident. In this accident, both of Vinod's legs were broken, in which we have FIR NO 657/21 Sections 279/337/338 IPC Police Station City Panipat against the driver of this vehicle. The case was registered by the city Panipat police in the case of accused Dev Sunar alias Deepak resident of Balraj Nagar, Bhatinda, Punjab, was arrested. About 10-15 days ago accused Dev Sunar came to me for a compromise in this case which we refused to compromise. He had also asked to meet Vinod but we refused and he did not compromise. He said that you will have to face the consequences of this. On 15.12.2021, during the day, Dev Sunar alias Deepak came to my nephew's house and I was also standing in the same street. He was carrying a pistol in his hand and Dev Sunar alias Deepak entered the room of Vinod and locked from inside and Vinod's wife Nidhi started to shout and scream. When I alongwith my son, Nidhi and a neighbour, tried to open the door, it did not open. When we saw from the window, Dev Sunar knocked Vinod down from the bed and decided to kill him. He fired two shots alternately from his



::3::

pistol at the waist and my nephew was covered in blood. Then we opened the door and went into the next room and when we got the chance, we controlled Dev Sunar and by that time the police reached there. The accused (Dev Sunar) and the Gun were handed over to the police. Then we took Vinod to Agrasen Hospital for treatment. There the doctor declared my nephew Vinod brought dead. As Dev Sunar alias Deepak has killed my nephew Vinod by firing a pistol, strict legal action should be taken against him. I have submitted my written application to you, Varinder Kumar.

3. The brother of the deceased-Vinod Kumar, namely, Parmod Kumar and the father-Surender Barada submitted an application before the Superintendent of Police, Panipat seeking a further investigation. On 03.06.2024, the complainant-Virender Kumar was rejoined in the investigation and his supplementary statement was recorded wherein he stated that he suspected Nidhi and Sumit to be involved in the murder of Vinod and that they have got him killed through the accused-Dev Sunar alias Deepak.

On 03.06.2024 itself, an audio call recording of a phone call of Dev Sunar alias Deepak while confined in District Jail, Panipat with his wife-Sita at his home on 29.03.2024 and 25.04.2024 from the PICS system was obtained wherein co-accused Sumit @ Bantu was found talking in conference with them. The call recording revealed that Sumit was stating that he would get good news soon and as the main witness-Nidhi (petitioner and wife of the deceased) had refused to testify against Dev Sunar alias Deepak. There were call recordings to the effect that Sumit was sending



::4::

money to Sita wife of Dev Sunar alias Deepak for the expenses of their children. The statements of Sukesh and Ravinder Kaur were recorded to the effect that Sumit was making payments to Sita wife of Dev Sunar alias Deepak for various expenses.

On 10.06.2024, records regarding the stay of co-accused/Sumit with Nidhi (petitioner) in Hotel Royal Kalinga Cottages, Rangri, Manali were obtained. The mobile phone of Sumit has revealed objectionable photographs of him alongwith Nidhi. The call details of Sumit would reveal that he has spoken multiple times with Sita wife of co-accused/ Dev Sunar alias Deepak. Similarly, there are details of multiple calls between the petitioner on the one hand and Sumit on the other *prima facie* establishing illicit relationship between them.

The statement of Kamiru Bano @ Niku was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. wherein she stated that she was working as domestic helper in the house of the deceased-Vinod and Nidhi (petitioner). On 15.12.2021, one man had entered in their house and wished Nidhi and asked about Vinod. On this, Nidhi sent him to the room of Vinod where the unknown person (Dev Sunar alias Deepak) had shot Vinod dead. The aforementioned statement was also recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case after many years of the occurrence on suspicion only. There is no admissible evidence against the petitioner. As she is in custody since 14.06.2024 but only 11 of the 65 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the Trial of the present



::5::

case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, she be granted the concession of interim bail on account of the medical condition of her son-Srijan.

5. The learned counsel for the State and the counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, while referring to the Status report dated 27.04.2026 which is already on record contend that the petitioner is the prime accused alongwith her paramour-Sumit who induced Dev Sunar alias Deepak to execute the murder of the deceased-Vinod. The family of Dev Sunar alias Deepak was being funded by Sumit. There is ample evidence on record to establish the illicit relation between the petitioner and Sumit. Further, the family of the petitioner is residing with their maternal grand-parents and maternal uncle. There are multiple people to take care of the son of the petitioner, namely, Srijan who is of the age of 21 years. The nature of the allegations do not entitle the petitioner to the grant of interim bail as there is every possibility that she would abscond from the justice in case she is granted the concession as prayed for.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is the prime accused alongwith Sumit who induced Dev Sunar alias Deepak to commit the offence in question. Srijan, the son of the petitioner is of the of 21 years and is old enough to get treated for his ailment. Even otherwise, the children of the petitioner are residing with their maternal grand-parents and maternal uncle who are in position to take care of him.

CRM-M-20412-2026 (O & M) 2026:PHHC:082640



::6::

8. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

9. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

May 25, 2026
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No