



245

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

**CRM-M No.20575 of 2026
Date of decision: 29.04.2026**

Navjot Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sumeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.518, dated 28.09.2022, under Sections 147, 149, 506 and 302 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station City Mandi, Dabwali, District Sirsa, Haryana.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Rani. It was alleged that her husband had already died and she was having two daughters, namely, Sukhwinder Kaur and Veerpal Kaur, and one son, namely Duni Chand, who was married with Suman and they have two daughters and one son. It was alleged that complainant's daughter, namely, Sukhwinder Kaur, being widow was residing with her. The house of her son Duni Chand is adjoining to her house and they can easily see through



the house of each other. It was alleged that three children of her son used to sleep with the complainant and her daughter. Duni Chand used to consume liquor occasionally and there used to be fight between Duni Chand and his wife Suman. It was alleged that on 27.09.2022, all the three children came to the complainant's house to sleep. At about 09:00 P.M. when they were sleeping in their house, they heard noise of Duni Chand calling for help. On this, complainant saw that Suman caught hold of head of her son and had put her hand over his mouth. Suman's sister's son Jagvir Singh was having Kapa in his hand while three other persons accompanying him were also armed with arms and were inflicting injuries to her son. When complainant raised alarm, all the assailants fled away from the spot after giving threats to kill them, if they dared to disclose anything to anybody, due to which they did not dare to come out of the house. On 28.09.2022, she came out and disclosed about the incident to the neighbors that her son Duni Chand had been killed by his son's wife Suman, his sister's son Jagvir and three others with sharp weapons. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 29.09.2022. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa, Haryana, praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge Sirsa declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 10.03.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing



CRM-M-19826-2025 praying for the grant of regular bail, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 18.08.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Suman and Saurav @ Kaka, who have been granted bail by this Court. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 30.03.2026 passed in **CRM-M-57697-2025 and CRM-M-14065-2026**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Suman and Saurav @ Kaka have been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 29.09.2022. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail by this Court.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Suman and Saurav @ Kaka. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 29.09.2022.



Co-accused, namely, Suman and Saurav @ Kaka are on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 03 years, 06 months & 27 days as on 27.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in *Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024*, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after 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 cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present cases, this Court is of the opinion that



learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parity.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.04.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No