



CRM-M-30981-2026

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

(213)

CRM-M-30981-2026

Date of Decision:- 01.07.2026

Sukhpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Ashok Paul Batra, Advocate and
Mr. Sanjeev Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Devender Singh.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate for the complainant.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0007 dated 08.01.2023, under Sections 302, 120-B and 34 of IPC (Corresponding Sections 103, 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS) and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Bhuna, District Fatehabad (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the material witnesses have been examined. It is submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.02.2023 and there is no likelihood of petitioner tampering with the evidence or intimidating the witnesses. Learned counsel



CRM-M-30981-2026

for the petitioner further submits that the other co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail and he be also considered for the concession on parity.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

4. Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate has put in appearance and files his memorandum of appearance on behalf of the complainant in Court today, which is taken on record.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the FIR No. 121 dated 30.05.2026 which has been stated to be one of the other case against the petitioner is wrong and incorrect and the said FIR No. 121 dated 02.06.2020 relates to one Sumit and the petitioner has no role to play in the said FIR.

6. However, learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the complainant have submitted that, in fact, another FIR No. 749 dated 22.11.2024 under the Prisons Act has been lodged against the petitioner for the reason that he is intimidating the complainant from the jail itself by making the reels and posting them on Instagram and therefore his intentions and *mens rea* are clear and there is ever likelihood that he will commit the same offence again, in case, he is granted the concession of bail.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties at length.

8. Admittedly, the petitioner is alleged to have fired with the weapon at the chest of the deceased, who happens to be the father of the complainant and further there is a clear eye witness to the alleged incident.



CRM-M-30981-2026

More so, on a specific query, learned State counsel has submitted that the trial is at the fag end and 37 witnesses out of 42 witnesses have been examined and the petitioner being the main accused cannot seek parity with the other co-accused.

9. Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the trial is at the fag end, this Court does not find it to be a fit case to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

01.07.2026

Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No
Yes/No