



CRM-M-20258-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-20258-2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Dhanpat @ Jagdip

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Palavi, Advocate for
Mr. Sahil Chaudhary, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.271 dated 26.08.2024, registered under Sections 103(1), 109(1), 3(5), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar, Sonapat.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Jitender. It was alleged that on 25.08.2024, at about 11:00 p.m., he alongwith his friend Naresh was present near the liquor shop at the village bus stand. Sombir @ Petla and Dhanpat (petitioner) were consuming alcohol there. Karamveer @ Pran was also present there. In the meantime, Sombir @ Petla and Naresh got into a quarrel. The complainant intervened and separated them. After some time, Sombir alongwith his friend Karamveer and Dhanpat attacked the complainant and Naresh with a sharp object with intention to kill them. Sombir stabbed Naresh in the neck which resulted into his death. Thereafter, they threatened the complainant to kill him and also attacked on his head



CRM-M-20258-2026

-2-

with intention to kill and thereafter, they fled away from the spot. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 26.08.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 15.11.2025. Earlier the petitioner approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-31536-2025 and CRM-M-68150-2025, however, the same were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 14.07.2025 and 09.12.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the alleged occurrence took place in the intervening night of 25.08.2024. She contends that as per the case of the prosecution, under the influence of the liquor, Sombir caused blow of the broken bottle in the neck of Naresh who succumbed to the injury. However, no specific allegation were levelled against the petitioner except being present at the time of occurrence. She contends that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. She further contends that the fatal blow was attributed to the co-accused. She submits that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 1½ years and all the material witnesses already stands examined. She, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is not only specifically named in the FIR, but he has played an active role in the offence committed. It is submitted that co-accused alongwith the petitioner opened attacked on the deceased, namely, Naresh, which resulted into his death. She submits that the petitioner also gave beatings to complainant Jitender. On instructions, she has submitted that out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that in the present case, the petitioner has been alleged to have given fist and leg blows to the complainant. The fatal injuries to the deceased were attributed to the co-accused. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 08 months & 03 days as on 28.04.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of 28 prosecution witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined, which shows that all the material witnesses have been almost examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is



CRM-M-20258-2026

-4-

ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable

Yes/No

: Yes/No2

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE