

**114****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-22841-2025****MANOJ PAL****.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT****CRM-M-64867-2025****RAJ KUMAR YADAV****.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT****DECIDED ON: 19.02.2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Joban Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-22841-2025), and
Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-64867-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-22841-2025 and CRM-M-64867-2025 shall stand disposed
of.

1. Present petitions have been filed by the petitioners, seeking
grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.65, dated 28.06.2020, under
Sections 302, 450, 148, 149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Balongi,
District SAS Nagar.

2. Incident in the present case occurred inside the house of the complainant at approximately 11:00 P.M. on 27.06.2020, and FIR was subsequently registered on 28.06.2020, at the instance of the complainant, Urmila, who is the wife of the deceased-Sanjay Yadav.

3. As per the allegations, complainant's husband, Sanjay Yadav, objected to young boys for urinating on the street. In response, the accused boys began arguing with him. Three boys allegedly threatened the complainant, stating that they would "teach him a lesson." Subsequently, 3-4 other boys were called to the front gate of the complainant's house and attacked her husband with sharp-edged weapons, targeting his head and legs. Upon hearing the commotion, the landlord-Harinder Singh, also arrived at the scene. Thereafter, Sanjay Yadav was taken to the hospital, where he was declared dead by the attending doctors.

4. Counsel for the petitioners submitted that both the petitioners are inside jail for a period of more than five years, and trial has not yet concluded. Further, during cross-examination, complainant, Urmila, could not establish the identity of the accused persons.

5. This Court has observed the examination-in-chief of the complainant, Urmila, who fully supported the prosecution's case by specifically identifying the accused persons, namely Raj Kumar Yadav (petitioner in CRM-M-64867-2025), Pardeep Singh alias Kallu, and

Manoj Kumar (petitioner in CRM-M-22841-2025). Another eye-witness, Harminder Singh, did not support the prosecution’s case.

6. Considering the conduct of accused persons including the petitioners, which resulted in death of an innocent person, their culpability—whether actual or not—will be determined by the trial court at the final stage. On the ground of extended incarceration alone, no concession of bail can be granted to the petitioners. **Accordingly, both the present petitions are dismissed.**

7. However, keeping in view that petitioners have already undergone incarceration for a period of five years and only six prosecution witnesses have been examined till date, this Court directs the trial court to prioritize the proceedings in the present case, and the trial shall be concluded expeditiously, preferably within six months from today.

19.02.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>