



111+218 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-23595-2025

Pardeep KumarPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

2. CRM-M-9887-2026

Sonu Bhatti @ SeesionPetitioner

versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

Date of decision: 21.05.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Jangvir Singh Hooda, Advocate (in CRM-M-23595-2025)
Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate (in CRM-M-9887-2026)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of
abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of filing the present
third petition praying for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.314 dated
30.10.2024, under Sections 103(1), 3(5), 61(2), 115(2) of BNS, registered at
Police Station Sadar Tauru, District Nuh.

3. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR was lodged on the
statement of Vijay Singh son of Ballu alias Balveer Singh. It was alleged that his
elder brother Jitendra was employed as a driver with Shiv Good Transport
Company and used to drive vehicle No.HR38V7728 belonging to Mukesh. At
night, he usually parks the vehicle at Issar Petrol Pump. Other drivers, namely,

Yogesh Naresh, Pradeep (petitioner in CRM-M-23595-2025) and Sonu @



Seesion (petitioner in CRM-M-9887-2026), also used to park their vehicles there. It was alleged that on 29.10.2024 at about 10:30 PM, the aforesaid persons allegedly quarrelled with the complainant's brother, Jitendra at Issar Petrol Pump, Tauru-Bilaspur Road near Village Sheikhpur and allegedly assaulted him with a sharp edged weapon due to previous enmity. As a result of the injuries sustained, the complainant's brother died at the spot. Thereafter, when he was taken to GH Hospital, Gurugram, he was declared dead. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced and petitioners were arrested on 12.12.2024 and 15.12.2024. On completion of the investigation, the trial commenced, challan filed and on framing of charges, trial commenced. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Faridkot, however, after hearing counsel for the parties, the same was declined vide orders dated 29.03.2025 and 20.01.2026. Being aggrieved, petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions.

4. Learned counsels for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present cases. It is contended that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant, Vijay. It is contended that though the petitioners are named in the FIR but there are general allegations against the accused mentioned in the FIR and no specific role had been attributed to the petitioners. It is submitted that the rivalry was between co-accused Naresh and the deceased. However, Naresh during investigation had committed suicide.

5. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner-Pradeep Kumar that it is Pradeep Kumar who has shifted the injured-Jitendra from the place of occurrence to the hospital. However, while taking to the hospital, he succumbed to the injuries. It is contended that the prosecution is relying upon video made by one of the witness namely, Sachin but Sachin has not supported the case of



the prosecution when he was produced before the trial Court as PW-7. It is submitted that PW-7 Paramvir has only submitted that he identified Pradeep Kumar present at the place of occurrence however, only presence at the occurrence at the relevant time, is not sufficient for proving his guilt.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner-Sonu Bhati @ Seesion has submitted that at per the statement made by PW-7 Paramvir, he was not even identified by the witnesses namely, he was examined before the trial Court. 7.

To buttress their arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents and they are behind the bars from last about 1½ years. As submitted, the material witnesses already stand examined. In the facts and circumstances of the case, it is submitted that the petitioners deserve to be granted the concession of regular bail.

8. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted during re-investigation on the orders of this Court, complicity of the petitioners is proved from the video made by the prosecution witness, namely, Sachin.

9. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report filed. He has submitted that presence of both the petitioners at the relevant time has been duly proved from the video recording. He has submitted that co-accused namely, Naresh with whom the deceased had a grudge, committed suicide during the trial. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 36 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioners.

10. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR was lodged on the statement of Vijay Singh. The petitioners though were named in the FIR, the allegations as contended were



omnibus in nature. Two eye-witnesses, namely, Sachin and Paramvir have been examined by the trial Court as PW-6 and PW-7. However, PW-6 Sachin has not supported the case of the prosecution whereas, PW-7 Paramvir has deposed before the Court regarding identifying Pradeep Kumar at the relevant time and qua Sonu, he did not identify. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that petitioner-Pradeep Kumar has undergone incarceration of 11 months and 01 days as on 15.11.2025. Custody certificate of petitioner-Sonu Bhati @ Seesion shows that he has undergone incarceration of 01 year, 05 months and 06 days as on 20.05.2026. It further reflects that both the petitioners are not involved in any other case. As submitted out of 36 prosecution witnesses, 07 witnesses already stand examined.

11. 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 case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

21.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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