

2026:PHHC:010564



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.51972 of 2025

Ranbir @ Ranvir Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	22.01.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	27.01.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	27.01.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the 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: Ms. Sakshi Khera, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The petitioner has been facing trial in case arising out of FIR No.62 dated 13.02.2014 registered under Sections 302, 201, 212 and 120-B of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station

2026:PHHC:010564



Hodal, District Palwal for committing offence of murder of victim Atar Singh and causing disappearance of his dead body. By way of this second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”), he is again seeking indulgence of this Court to grant benefit of regular bail. His previous petition had been dismissed by this Court on 13.01.2025.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been in prolonged incarceration for over a period of 02 years and 10 months. The trial has not progressed much so far, as only 09 out of 40 prosecution witnesses have been examined. The co-accused Ravi Kumar whose case was on similar footing, has already been extended benefit of bail by the trial Court itself. The delay in conclusion of trial militates against his fundamental right to speedy trial. Each day spent by him in custody has furnished a reason for extending benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

3. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that the petition is not maintainable being a second petition for grant of regular bail and the previous one having been dismissed by passing a detailed order by this Court. It is also argued that the petitioner was an active participant in the occurrence of committing murder of the victim. He remained at bay for a period of more than eight years after committing the crime. Once released on bail, there are chances of his absconding again. There is no substantive

2026:PHHC:010564



change in the circumstances. It is, thus, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

5. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have killed the victim on 12.04.2014. His previous petition was dismissed by this Court by passing a detailed order. Undoubtedly, a second/successive regular bail petition is maintainable. However, in such petition to succeed, the petitioner shall be essentially required to show substantial change in circumstances. Cogent and lucid reasons are required to be recorded for granting plea of bail if such a plea is taken in successive petition. The petitioner is seeking bail mainly on the ground of his extended period of incarceration. He has been in custody for a period of over 02 years and 10 months. The allegations make out a prima facie case showing his complicity in the offence of murder of the victim which was committed in a brutal manner. Merely because of his prolonged incarceration in such like case, he cannot be held entitled to be extended benefit of bail, in the considered opinion of this Court. In this context, this Court places reliance upon 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)*. The petitioner has not been able to show any substantive change in the circumstances warranting exercise of powers by this Court for grant of bail. Accordingly, finding no reasonable ground, the



petition is dismissed.

6. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.01.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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