



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

128 CRM-M-29138-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.03.2026

RAVI ... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Shivansh Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-5734-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

The Annexures P-12 and P-13 are ordered to be taken on record subject to all just exceptions. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place of the paper book.

MAIN CASE

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.447 dated 27.06.2022 under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC (Section 25 of the Arms Act added later on) registered at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Deepak had been stabbed to death and one Shubham is stated to be the eyewitness of the occurrence, who has supported the case of the prosecution during his evidence before the trial Court. The

petitioner had also participated in the offence and was present at the spot. As such, he was arrested in the present case and had been facing trial.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that while deposing before the trial Court as PW4, the abovenamed eyewitness stated that the petitioner had inflicted injuries on the shoulder and ribs of the deceased with a sharpened edged weapon. However, the said deposition has been contradicted by the CCTV footage which shows that the petitioner has not participated in the occurrence, however, his presence at the spot is not disputed. He further submits that the petitioner was 18 years old at the time of the alleged occurrence and he is in custody for the last 03 years, 08 months and 07 days. It is further submitted that out of 18 witnesses, 07 witnesses remain to be examined. Hence, the trial will take long time to conclude. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years 08 months and 07 days.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years 08 months and 07 days coupled with the fact that the trial of the case is likely to take some

more time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 09, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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