

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



**CRA-S-2881-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.02.2026**

TEJ SINGH

... APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER

... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate for the appellant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant is seeking regular bail in FIR No.269 dated 06.09.2022, under Sections 302, 201, 120-B, 216, 34 IPC and Section 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Linepar Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar

2. The case of the prosecution is that a blind FIR was lodged by the complainant stating that he had received information that the dead body of his eldest son, Paramvir, was lying near a drain. During the course of investigation, on the basis of the disclosure statement made by Parmod, who is the uncle of the deceased, it was stated that he had last seen the appellant in the company of the deceased.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that, apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other corroborative evidence against the appellant. It is further contended that the alleged motive put forth by the prosecution is that both the appellant and the deceased were in a relationship

with one Usha, and that on this account the deceased was murdered. However, the said motive appears to be weak, particularly in view of the fact that the appellant is a married person. It is also stated that, pursuant to the disclosure statement of the appellant, the wallet of the deceased was recovered. It does not appear plausible that the appellant would retain the wallet of the deceased, especially when it was of no significant monetary value. Additionally, the axe allegedly recovered after a considerable lapse of time could not reasonably be expected to bear blood stains. Since this is a case of circumstantial evidence, there is no direct evidence against the appellant. The appellant is in custody for the last 03 years, 04 months and one day.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Satbir Singh Kanwar, Advocate has appeared on behalf of the complainant and vehemently oppose the prayer for grant of regular bail to the appellant. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the appellant is in custody for the last 03 years, 04 months and one day. Learned State counsel further submits that out of 50 prosecution witnesses, only 7 have been examined so far and he is involved in one more case.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that this is a case of circumstantial evidence and there is no direct evidence against the appellant; the appellant is in custody for the last 03 years, 04 months and one

day; out of 50 prosecution witnesses, only 7 have been examined so far; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the appellant would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the appellant during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant appeal is allowed. The appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order, in case the appellant indulges in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to move an application for cancellation of his bail.

25.02.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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