



CRM-M-41526-2025(O&M)

1

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

145

CRM-M-41526-2025(O&M)

Decided on :24.02.2026

Punit

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Dr. Rishi Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.178 dated 08.03.2024, under Sections 302, 201, 34 IPC and Sections 25,27,29 of Arms Act (Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act mentioned in the order dated 19.07.2025), registered at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

2. As per the prosecution case, the incident in question took place on 08.03.2024, in which the victim, Veerpal, was stabbed and subsequently lost his life. The FIR was lodged by Surajpal, who is the brother of the deceased.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, according to the allegations in the FIR, it was the deceased Veerpal himself who, at about 3:00 p.m., informed the complainant that he had received a knife blow. However, when he was taken to the hospital, the doctor declared him dead. It is argued that the FIR does not describe any role of the petitioner, nor does it allege that petitioner handed over the knife to the

**CRM-M-41526-2025(O&M)****2**

main assailant-Tushar. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has no connection with the crime and has been falsely implicated in the case.

4. Counsel also points out that material witnesses, namely Surajpal (PW1), Rajneesh Kumar (PW2), Sunil (PW3), Anmol (PW5), and Pugli (PW6), have not supported the prosecution's case and have specifically identified the main accused, Tushar, as responsible for the crime. The petitioner has been in custody for a period of one year and eleven months, and, on these grounds, counsel prays for the grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioner is a habitual offender, being involved in six other criminal cases, and, in view of his criminal antecedents, he should not be granted the concession of regular bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

7. Considering the fact that petitioner is in custody for a period of approximately one year and eleven months, and that petitioner's name does not appear in the FIR, while the allegations subsequently attributed to him were deleted, the said aspects would be determined finally by the trial Court after the complete set of evidence is placed before it. It is also noticed that the material witnesses, as detailed above, have already turned hostile, as per the petitioner's counsel. Out of a total of 23 prosecution witnesses, 11 have been examined and 12 are yet to depose before the

**CRM-M-41526-2025(O&M)****3**

Court. In view of the above, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial 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.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

24.02.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No