

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

2026:PHHC:084121



CRM-M-26767-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 26.05.2026.

ROHIT@ SONU @ RITLA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

PRESENT Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the **fourth** petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.266 dated 20.08.2020, registered under Section(s) 302, 323, 34 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of Sanjay son of Late Dharambir Singh, which reads thus: -

“To the SHO Police Station Beri, Sir it is requested that I am Sanjay S/O Late Dharambir Singh, resident of Dubaldhan Pana Vidhan and I work in GRIEF. Today on 19.08.2020 at around 8.30/9.00 pm, my uncle Ramesh left our house to go to

his cattle yard (Gher). After some time, I also left my house for the cattle yard (Gher). When I reached near the shop of Sandeep S/O Satbir, my uncle Ramesh was buying beedi matches from the shop. There has been a mutual enmity between the two families in our village for some time. Today at Sandeep's shop, Bholu S/O Leela and Totaliya S/O Satbir were fighting with Rohtash S/O Jaina. Then my uncle Ramesh tried to free Rohtash and started explaining to Bholu S/O Leela and Totaliya S/O Satbir. Bholu and Totaliya then said that you too have become a Panchayat member, due to which you are bad in our eyes. Totaliya told Bholu to shoot him first. On saying this, Bholu S/O Leela fired a direct shot at my uncle Ramesh with the weapon in his hand. I raised an alarm, and hearing the noise, some more people came. Bholu and Totaliya said that no one should come between us; whoever comes will be killed, and, threatening them, they ran away from the spot with their weapons. When my cousin Naveen S/O Ramesh, Sandeep and I were making my uncle sit in the car for treatment, at that time, Bholu, Totaliya and a couple of other people came in a car. They abused us and threatened to kill us, saying that this is just the beginning, and they will kill all of us. Bholu and Totaliya, having a grudge, shot my uncle Ramesh, due to which my uncle died. I request you to take strict action against Bholu S/O Leela, Totaliya S/O Satbir and other people in the car. SD/ SANJAY KUMAR Sanjay Kumar S/O Late Dharamveer R/O Dubaldhan Pana Vidhan Mo. No. 9467871597”

State counsel contends that 24 out of 35 prosecution witnesses already stand examined in the present case and that the trial is now fixed for 07.09.2026, for which four prosecution witnesses have been summoned. He submits that in any case, the prosecution shall conclude its evidence within a period of six months commencing from 01.07.2026.

Mr. Rupender Singh, Advocate, enters appearance and files power of attorney on behalf of the injured/eye-witness Rohtash. He contends that the petitioner and his co-accused have been threatening the complainant and other witnesses and are pressurizing them not to depose against them. He contends that the petitioner has been instrumental in threatening the prosecution witnesses. He submits that second petition bearing CIS No.BA-754-2022, filed by the petitioner before the Sessions Court for the grant of regular bail, was dismissed by the Sessions Judge, Jhajjar, vide order dated 06.06.2024, and the said fact was specifically noticed by the Court itself. It was also recorded that PW Rohtash had moved a specific application before the Court about the petitioner having threatened him, and the said application was forwarded to the Superintendent of Police, Jhajjar, for inquiry. The relevant part of the order dated 06.06.2024 reads as under: -

*“It is not in dispute that on 01.09.2023, at the time of examination of material independent witnesses, the applicant-accused alongwith his co-accused Mohit @ Bholu threatened them and application against them was moved by PW Rohtash, which was forwarded to SP, Jhajjar for taking legal action against them. This very conduct of applicant-accused shows that there are clear cut indication about endanger to the life of complainant party. Further, the accused persons are of same vicinity. The mere fact that the applicant-accused has already undergone certain period of incarceration by itself is not sufficient to grant bail to the applicant-accused. The fact that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future either by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration would not be sufficient for enlarging the applicant on bail when the gravity of the offence alleged is severe. Authority titled as **Kalyan Chandra***

Sarkar vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav, 2004 (2) RCR (Criminal) 254, can be referred on this point.”

State counsel further contends that there are three other cases in which the petitioner is an undertrial.

I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the respective parties, gone through the documents and considered the submissions advanced.

Taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner, the stage of the trial, as well as the undertaking given by the respondent to conclude the trial within a period of six months commencing w.e.f. 01.07.2026, and also the specific finding recorded by the Court of Sessions that the petitioner threatened the prosecution witnesses and his criminal antecedents, I do not deem it appropriate to allow the present petition at this stage. Accordingly, the same is dismissed. However, the prosecution shall remain bound to conclude the prosecution evidence within the specified time as undertaken today.

May 26, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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