



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

214

CRM-M-33971-2026

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

Govind

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Luhani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short the "BNSS") is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.108, dated 31.05.2025 under Sections 103(1), 126, 127(2), 190, 191 (2), 191 (3), 61 of BNS, 2023 (corresponding Sections 302, 339, 342, 149, 147, 148, 120(a), 120(b) IPC) registered at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa.

2. On a complaint submitted by one Rameshwar, the FIR in question was registered. The allegation was that on 30.05.2025, Rohtash, Nikhil, Mukesh, Jagdish, Sethio, Raju and Ballaram assaulted him, his son Sanwara and his daughter-in-law with sticks, axe etc. His son Sanwara suffered injuries as a result of which, he later expired. The petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statements suffered by few of the co-accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 26.06.2025; the complainant, as also the wife of the deceased have not

supported the case of the prosecution; co-accused Om Parkash has been granted regular bail by a coordinate Bench vide order dated 25.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-17675-2026; out of a total of 23 witnesses, only 8 witnesses have been examined and, therefore, trial will take a sufficiently long time and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel representing the State of Haryana has opposed the bail petition. However, custody of 1 year and 03 days is stated to have been undergone by the petitioner as per the custody certificate filed in the Court today. As per the custody certificate, no other case stands registered against the petitioner.

5. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 26.06.2025. More than a year has elapsed. He was not named in the FIR. Still further, the complainant Rameshwar and the wife of the deceased have not supported the case of the prosecution. The statements of the said witnesses have been produced in Court by learned counsel for the petitioner, which have been perused. The antecedents of the petitioner are stated to be clean and he is not required in any other case. Out of a total of 23 witnesses, only 8 witnesses have yet been examined meaning thereby that the trial will take a sufficiently long time to conclude. Under the circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

7. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his

furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

July 01, 2026

vcgarg

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