

2026.PHHC.074851



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-20151-2026

Naveen @ Gandhi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	12.05.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	14.05.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	14.05.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rahul Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 35 dated 29.01.2024 registered under Sections 201 and 302 of IPC (Sections 120-B, 201, 202 and 34 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Yamuna Nagar Sadar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by the complainant-Mahender Singh on 29.01.2024 alleging therein that his elder son Rajan was married with one Rajni about

2026.PHHC.074851



three years back. About one year ago, his son had left home without informing anyone and thereafter they had lost all contact with him. On the same day, on coming to know that the dead body of his son was lying in the area of village Gulabgarh near Yamuna Canal, he had reached there and identified the same. By alleging that someone had killed his son, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body of the victim was conducted and it was found that he had sustained a head injury, which alone was sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature.

3. During the course of investigation, accused Sahil Alvi, who was arrested in a case bearing FIR No. 76 dated 29.01.2024, registered at Police Station City Karnal, suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the murder of the victim Rajan committed on 28.01.2024, and also disclosed about the complicity of the present petitioner and co-accused Firoz Khan on the asking of accused Salik @ Abu Satik. The above named Sahil Alvi was further joined into the investigation of the present case and suffered another disclosure statement to the effect that on the instructions of co-accused Salik @ Abu and others, a plan was made to eliminate the victim and in pursuance of the said conspiracy, on 28.01.2024, he along with the present petitioner and co-accused Firoz Khan had called the victim near Gulabgarh area, they had taken him to Yamuna Canal side where he was shot at by accused Firoz Khan and Sahil Alvi, and thereafter petrol was sprinkled upon his body and it was set ablaze to destroy identity. He was formally arrested in the present case. The petitioner and co-accused were nominated as additional

2026.PHHC.074851



accused. The petitioner was arrested on 01.03.2024. He too suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and demarcated the place of occurrence. Subsequently, the other accused were also arrested. Investigation in the matter now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for a period of more than 02 years and 02 months. He was not named in the FIR and has been implicated on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. There is no eyewitness to the murder of the victim and the entire case rests upon circumstantial evidence. Apart from the disclosure statement of the co-accused, there is no other circumstance to connect him with the murder of the victim. The trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Sahil Alvi. He is in custody since

2026.PHHC.074851



01.03.2024. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial is taking place at a very low pace, as none out of 47 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner would abscond, will tamper with the evidence, or will not cooperate in the trial if extended the benefit of bail. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore and he has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

14th May, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |