



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

CRM-M-29633-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision:27.05.2026

Subhash

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
 Mr. Bharat Singh, Advocate
 Mr. Nitin Sansanwal, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sukesh Kumar Jindal, Advocate
Mr. Tajinder Malik, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S,2023 with a prayer to grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No. 187, dated 08.06.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 103(1), 3(5), 351(3) of B.N.S, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act,{302,307,34,506 of IPC}, Police Station Madlauda, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the F.I.R in the present case was registered on the basis of the complaint moved by Ram Chander, who alleged that about 35 years ago, the complainant and the

petitioner had jointly purchased agricultural land measuring seven acres. In the family partition, the said land had fallen to the share of the complainant and due to this, Subhash was having a grudge against him and was demanding his share in the land in question. Even several *Panchayats* were convened, but no settlement could be arrived at between the parties. At about 11:30 AM on 08.06.2025, another *Panchayat* was convened, in which their relatives were also present. During *Panchayat*, the petitioner allegedly caught hold of Sunil, since deceased, whereas, his son Jaipal allegedly inflicted knife blows on him. When Anil son of complainant tried to rescue his brother Sunil, Jaipal also stabbed Anil in a pre-planned manner. Thereafter, Subhash and Jaipal had extended threats to them.

3. Learned counsel further submits that as per the admitted case of the prosecution, the petitioner had caught hold of deceased, whereas, injuries were caused by Jaipal co-accused. In fact, the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case, as he is father of Jaipal, main accused. Even otherwise, the petitioner had not played any role nor had caused any injury to Sunil, deceased or Anil, injured. Learned counsel further refers to the screenshots (Annexure P-6), which were taken from a video of the *Panchayat*, wherein, the petitioner was simply seen at the spot during the scuffle and neither he was carrying any weapon nor had caused any injury to either the deceased or the injured. He further submits that even in the entire occurrence, no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and he never intended to cause injuries to anyone. Even, Sunil, deceased and the complainant are close relatives and he had no intention to cause murder of anyone. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 09.06.2025 and is in custody for the last more than 11 months. The

statement of Anil, injured has been partly recorded and he has supported the case of the prosecution. Thus, there are no chances of tampering with the prosecution evidence.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of crime and was admittedly present at the place of occurrence. Apart from that, the trial is at the initial stage and the petition may be ordered to be dismissed.

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

6 In the present case, it is apparent from the photographs (Annexure P-6), that there was a scuffle during *Panchayat* and several villagers and common relatives of the parties were also present in the *Panchayat*. Still further, the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he had caught hold of Sunil, deceased and Anil, injured, while injuries were caused to them by Jaipal, son of the petitioner. Apart from that, no other role has been assigned to the present petitioner. Still further, in the present case, the statement of the injured Anil has been partly recorded and the petitioner may not be in a position to tamper with the prosecution evidence. Still further, the petitioner is a rustic villager and is a first offender and there are no chances of fleeing from the process of justice. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his

furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/
Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioner shall surrender his passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case he is not holder of the same, he shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioner shall also file his affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by him during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, he shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioner is involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two heavy local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner.

8. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move

an application in this regard.

9. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s), disposed of, accordingly.

27.05.2026

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

hitesh