

2026:PHHC:030843



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48834-2025 (O&M)

Vinod @ Vinodi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	25.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	26.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	26.02.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. K. D. S. Hooda, Advocate,
Mr. Sumit Ruhel, Advocate and
Mr. Ankit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the third that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case arising out of FIR No. 66 dated 02.03.2020, registered under Sections 302, 34, 120-B and 411 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, District Hisar. His previous petitions were dismissed as withdrawn.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement

2026:PHHC:030843



recorded by the complainant Sushma alleging therein that, in the morning of 02.03.2020, her husband had gone outside the house and in the street to put garbage in the garbage van. She was inside her house and heard sounds of busting some crackers. She came outside and found her husband lying on the ground, whereas one youth wearing helmet was firing shots with a pistol towards her husband. One more youth was also found standing by the side of the assailant. Both of them fled away on a motorbike, which they had parked in the street. The victim was rushed to the hospital but had succumbed to his injuries. Raising suspicion that some residents of village Sulakni were nursing grudge against her husband and might have a hand in the homicidal death of her husband, she prayed for taking action. On her complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted. The petitioner accused Vinod was arrested on 03.03.2020. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also about the active participation of co-accused, who had fired shots at the victim. Co-accused Sandeep was also arrested on 15.03.2020. He too suffered disclosure statement on interrogation and got recovered one pistol and a live cartridge. Some other persons were also nominated and arrested subsequently. Investigation now stands completed. The petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of a disclosure statement alleged to have been suffered by him in some other case, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. There is no

2026:PHHC:030843



eyewitness to the murder of the victim and in fact, it was a blind murder. The complainant had reached at the place of occurrence after it had taken place. In fact, he has been roped in this case by the complainant due to the fact that he was pursuing a criminal case registered against the complainant, her husband and daughter bearing FIR No. 205 dated 25.08.2018, registered under Sections 306 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Agroha. He was a prime witness to that case. From the CCTV footage, which has been relied upon by the investigating agency, his identity has not been established. The complainant stands examined. There are no chances of his intimidating the witnesses. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. The complainant and her daughter had duly identified the petitioner in the CCTV footage, in which the details of the incident had been captured. The trial is going on at a proper pace and can be expedited further. It is, thus, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner along with the co-accused had murdered the victim on 02.03.2020. Annexure P-6 is copy of sworn testimony of the complainant Sushma and a perusal of the same reveals that she fully supported the prosecution version and also identified the petitioner as well as the co-accused from the CCTV footage of the camera, which was installed in the vicinity. She also identified the petitioner as the bike

2026:PHHC:030843



driver in the CCTV footage. The petitioner has criminal antecedents. The allegations against him are quite grave in nature. Substantial number of prosecution witnesses have already been examined. The well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody is not sufficient ground for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in ***Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242 and State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)***. In view the discussion as made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

26.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No