



CRM-M-32678-2025and
CRM-M-34763-2025

1

222 (2 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32678-2025

Krishan @ Joni

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CRM-M-34763-2025

Virender @ Rahul @ Dolki

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Decided on: 17.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Chirag Kundu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in both cases)

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

Mr. Sunil Saharan, Advocate
for the complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of this common order, all the above-mentioned both petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.

2. Both the above mentioned accused namely—(i) Krishan @ Joni and (ii)

Virender @ Rahul @ Dolki have filed bail petitions under Section 483 of BNSS,



2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
407	10.10.2024	109(1), 3(5), 347(1), 61(2) of BNS and Section 25/27/29-54-59 of Arms Act	Kaithal City	Kaithal

3. As per allegations, the husband of the petitioner namely Satbir Singh was residing separately and wanted to sell 4 ½ acre of land situated in Narnaund against the wishes of other members. For stopping him, to execute the sale deed in favour of any one, complainant-Saroj Devi had filed one civil suit for seeking injunction against sale of the land. Feeling aggrieved with the pendency of the civil suit in concern to the said land, he got fire shots upon the complainant, on 10.10.2024 at about 9.00 a.m., when she was going for attending the duty. The persons, who fired shots, were identified in the witness box by the complainant as petitioner-Krishan @ Jony, driving motorcycle and Virender @ Rahul @ Dolki, who fired one single shot upon the injured/complainant – Saroj Devi.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that, had there been any intention to kill the injured/complainant, the shot would have been targeted at some vital part of the injured. The one single fire shot had caused injury on the injured/complainant. He further argues that the identification in the Court is to be treated as first time identification, after being tutored because during the Test Identification Parade (TIP), conducted during investigation, none was identified as accused by the complainant, therefore, it would be moot question to be decided by



**CRM-M-32678-2025and
CRM-M-34763-2025**

3

the trial Court at final stage, whether identification done by the accused for the first time is on the basis of some tutoring or once to prove the allegations.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that both the petitioners have fired a shot to kill her and use of fire arm is sufficient to assume that there was an intention to cause murder of the victim. After being arrested there was recovery of .32 bore pistol from both the petitioners.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties.

7. Considering all the circumstances and noticing the aspect that the injured/complainant has already been examined in the witness box and authenticity of truth is yet to be ascertained by going through the complete set of evidence, which is yet to be adduced before the trial Court. Out of total 29 prosecution witnesses, only 07 have been examined till date.

In view of the above, the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners namely, (i) Krishan @ Joni and (ii) Virender @ Rahul @ Dolki, are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial



**CRM-M-32678-2025and
CRM-M-34763-2025**

Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

- 10. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
- 11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

17.02.2026
reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*