



CRM-M-48186-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

129

CRM-M-48186-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.03.2026

Suresh @ Joker

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The present first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.277 dated 07.04.2024, under Sections 324, 307, 506, 212 & 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Hisar.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case are that on 07.04.2024, a ruqqa was received from General Hospital, Hisar, reporting that one Prem, son of Ram Chander, had been admitted after sustaining injuries due to an assault. Statement of the injured was recorded after obtaining medical opinion, wherein he stated that on 05.04.2024, at about 6.30 pm, while he and one Om Parkash were having tea at the house of one Manohar in Village Dhansu, the petitioner and his wife Radha arrived and threatened to kill them. Fifteen minutes later, the petitioner inflicted a knife injury on Prem's abdomen and fled from the scene. Om Parkash brought the injured to the



hospital. Accordingly, FIR was registered and the petitioner was taken in custody.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 04.09.2024 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year 06 months and only 01 out of the total 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel refers to the status report and contends that the petitioner caused the injury on account whereof offence under Section 307 IPC was added. He further contends that the petitioner is a repeat offender and he is involved in as many as 8 other incidents. He, however, does not dispute that of the 8 cases specified, no information is available with respect to 3 offences while he has been acquitted in 4 and had confessed to commission of crime under the Excise Act.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, coupled with the stage of trial, wherein out of 15 prosecution witnesses only 1 has been examined so far, hence the trial will take a long time to conclude, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.



7.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
8.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

12.03.2026
monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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