



CRM-M-46334-2025

-1-

(114+116)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46334-2025

Date of Decision: 27.02.2026

HARPAL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CRM-M-60834-2025

DAYA RAM

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Mukul Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-46334-2025.

Mr. R.S. Rai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Anuraj Arora, Advocate and Mr. Rehan Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-60834-2025.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing No.CRM-M-46334-2024 titled as Harpal Singh versus State of Haryana and CRM-M-60834-2025 titled as Daya Ram Versus State of Haryana as the same are arising out of the same FIR. However, for the sake of convenience the facts have been taken from CRM-M-46334-2025.

**CRM-M-46334-2025****-2-**

2. The prayer in the present petitions under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.164 dated 17.06.2023 registered under Sections 302, 307, 212, 506, 34, 120-B IPC and Sections 25(1b)(a) of Arms Act at Police Station Manesar, District Haryana.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that Harpal Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-46334-2025) and Daya Ram (petitioner in CRM-M-60834-2025) are not named in the FIR. As per the prosecution case one Saurabh alias Definite procured the weapons of offence from one Sandeep Maheshwari and provided the weapons to Harpal Singh and Daya Ram who further handed over the same to the actual assailants namely, Deepak and Saurabh alias Sandu. However, the entire prosecution case is based on disclosure statements and there is no admissible evidence available against them. As the petitioners are in custody since 24.04.2024 and 19.06.2023 respectively but only 17 of the 65 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, they are entitled to the concession of bail.

3. On the other hand, the learned State counsel while referring to the replies dated 05.11.2025 & 13.12.2025 contends that the petitioners are hardcore criminals with multiple cases registered against them inasmuch as Harpal Singh has two other cases and Daya Ram has five other cases. Therefore, the petitioners are not entitled to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioners are in custody since 24.04.2024 and

**CRM-M-46334-2025****-3-**

19.06.2023 respectively but only 17 of the 65 of the prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioners and their co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioners are in custody since 24.04.2024 and 19.06.2023 respectively but only 17 of the 65 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation the further incarceration of the petitioners is not required.

6. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. The petitioners shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that they are not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

8. If the petitioners or their family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.

2026.PHHC:032518



CRM-M-46334-2025

-4-

8. In addition, the petitioners (or anyone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

9. The petitions stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

27.02.2026

JITESH

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