



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

137

Date of decision: 30.03.2026

CRM-M-51637-2025

SUMITPetitioner
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CRM-M-14135-2026

MEENA @ MEENA KUMARIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Sushil Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-51637-2025.

Mr. Rajesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-14135-2026.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Both these petitions, having been filed by the two accused in the same FIR, are being decided by a common order.
2. The petitioner(s) herein are seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 151 dated 29.07.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 201, 404, 120-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station

Bond Kalan, District Charkhi Dadri.

3. For the facility of reference, the facts are being referred to from CRM-M-51637-2025 titled as “*Sumit versus State of Haryana*”. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Umesh son of Rajbir Singh resident of Village Rankhanda, District Jhajjar, which reads thus:-

“....It is respectfully submitted that I Umesh son of Rajbir am resident of village Rankhanda District Jhajjar. We are two brothers. My elder brother Dinesh aged 35 years was married and had two daughters and one son. Dinesh used to work as a Bhagat (religious performer) in village Jhinjhar. My aunts (Bhua) Bala and Rajpati are married. My brother Dinesh was on friendly terms with Sandeep son of Harirai resident of Jhinjhar. On 28.07.2023, Dinesh told his wife Manju that he was going to Jhinjhar to meet Sandeep and he left Rankhanda at around 3:00 PM. At about 7:00 PM Manju informed me that she had called Dinesh on phone but Sandeep (resident of Jhinjhar) answered it. He abused her and did not let her talk to Dinesh. Thereafter, I also tried to call my brother but his phone was switched off. Then through our neighbour Sonu Patwari, I tried calling Dinesh's number again. Sandeep picked up and told us that they had beaten Dinesh and made him run away. For the past two or three days, Sandeep (resident of Jhinjhar) had been repeatedly calling my brother to come to his place. Today upon receiving information, we went to the fields at village Kohlawas at Sandeep's farm and found the dead body of my brother lying there with multiple injuries on his body. It is clear that my brother has been murdered by Sandeep son of Hariram resident of Jhinjhar along with his associates. Thus post-mortem of my brother's body may kindly be conducted and legal action be taken against the culprits who murdered my

brother. Yesterday evening we had called 112 about this incident. They told us that they had forwarded the matter to Police Post Achina. The police had talked with Sandeep and then sent us back home by saying that action would be taken in the morning.”

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contend that there was no specific allegation against the petitioners and that even as per version of the FIR, when Manju (widow of the deceased) called Dinesh upon the phone, the same was answered by main accused Sandeep (Husband of petitioner-Meena @ Meena Kumari in CRM-M-14135-2026), who informed that he had killed Dinesh. Counsel contend that as per the investigation conducted, the petitioner Meena @ Meena Kumari is stated to have been in a relationship, in the past, with the deceased Dinesh and that the said fact had been conveyed by petitioner- Meena @ Meena Kumari to main accused Sandeep herself. It was thereafter that Sandeep called petitioner-Sumit (CRM-M-51637-2025) to the room constructed at the tube well and they consumed liquor. The deceased was thereafter given beatings with a danda blow. Counsel contend that the entire version is improbable and that even as per the evidence collected, there is no evidence to conclusively establish that any of the injuries was caused by the said petitioner. The case is based upon circumstantial evidence and on the alleged disclosure of the petitioners, which is not corroborated by any recovery or evidence. He further contends that PW-1 Umesh Kumar has already been examined since then and even in his testimony before the Court, no attribution has been made against the petitioner-Sumit. It is contended that the petitioners have clean antecedents and are in custody since 03.08.2023 and 31.07.2023 respectively. They have undergone an actual custody of nearly 02 years and

08 months and that only 14 out of 37 witnesses have been examined so far.

5. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the said facts.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the clean antecedents of the petitioners, the period of custody already undergone, the stage of trial as well as arguable issues with respect to the allegations levelled against the petitioners and the defence raised by them, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioners on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. The instant petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

MARCH 30, 2026

Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No