



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M-20065-2026
Decided on : 18.05.2026

Deepak . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Ms. Kashish Bansal, Advocate
for the complainant(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Deepak	593	14.10.2025	S. 109(1), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (corresponding S. 307 & 34 of IPC) and S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (later on added S.190, 191(3) of BNS, 2023) (corresponding S. 149 & 148 of IPC)	Industrial Sector 29	Panipat

2. Incident in question took place on 13.10.2025 at about 10:00 P.M., complainant – Gurdev was present at home, came to know of suffering of fire-arm injury by his son – Sumit. By taking necessary steps, complainant took his son in injured condition to ARTIOS Hospital, where, his son told that, *“I received a call on my mobile number 7u404881206 from*



the mobile number 35699475602 of Jitender Singh and he called me outside. When I reached outside in the street, in a vehicle there were 4 to 5 boys therein. Out of them one boy, with an intention to kill me had fired a short upon me.”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during investigation, it surfaced that services of one shooter, namely Sombir from Jind, had allegedly been hired and it was he who fired the shot from close range upon injured Sumit.

It is further submitted that co-accused Jitender, who had allegedly called the injured outside, was arrested and upon his arrest, disclosed the name of the present petitioner – Deepak as accompanying them at the time of occurrence. However, neither any specific allegation nor any active role has been attributed to the petitioner regarding commission of any overt act in the incident, except the allegation of his alleged presence along with other accused persons.

4. Learned counsel further submits that even as per investigation, no telephonic conversation between the petitioner and the other accused persons has surfaced, as is evident from the order dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-2), whereby the learned trial Court declined bail to the petitioner.

It is contended that the involvement of the petitioner is yet to be established by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt. Besides, the petitioner is inside the jail since 16.10.2025 and material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Thus, conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

Accordingly, in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances,



prayer has been made for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while producing status report dated 15.05.2026 in Court today, opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view the nature of allegations and the role attributed to the petitioner, he does not deserve concession of regular bail at this stage.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that none of the twenty prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

7. Keeping in view the nature of allegations and particularly the fact that no specific overt act has been attributed to the present petitioner, this Court does not find any justification for prolonging his further incarceration inside the jail.

It is also a matter of record that the petitioner is inside the jail since 16.10.2025 and none of the cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Thus, chances are very bleak of conclusion of the trial in near future.

It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner is not involved in any other case of similar nature.

8. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, and taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances, the period of custody already undergone, and the stage of trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial



Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

11. However, before parting with the present order, it is clarified that in case, after release on bail, the petitioner is found indulging in influencing the prosecution witnesses, tampering with the evidence, or extending threats to the injured/complainant, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail, supported by cogent material.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 18, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No