



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

151

CRM-M-54810-2025  
Decided on : 16.03.2026

Jitesh Kumar @ Monu . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, AAG, Haryana.

Mr Lupil Gupta, Advocate,  
Mr. Varun Singla, Advocate and  
Mr. Harshdeep Singh, Advocate, for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

| Name of<br>Petitioner(s) | FIR<br>No. | Date       | Section(s)               | Police<br>Station | District |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Jitesh Kumar<br>@ Monu   | 179        | 17.11.2024 | 109(1), 126 of BNS, 2023 | Sadar<br>Sohna    | Gurugram |

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 17.11.2024, a complaint was received from the complainant stating that he is working in a laboratory at Gurugram. He has one younger sister (the victim) and her marriage was fixed for 24.11.2024. On 17.11.2024 at about 2:00 PM, she had gone to a shop. It is alleged that while she was returning, the accused stabbed her multiple times, due to which she sustained injuries. It is further alleged that Davender and Pooja, along with family members of the accused, were also present at the spot. Thereafter, his uncle Tejpal took the injured to Acropolis Hospital, Badshahpur. On the basis of the said



complaint, a formal FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant – Deepak and the injured – Monika have already been examined before the trial Court and both have supported the case of the prosecution.

It is further submitted that the petitioner is inside the jail for a period of more than 01 year and 04 months. It is contended that once the material witnesses have been examined, there is no likelihood of the petitioner influencing the witnesses or causing any delay in the trial proceedings. It is also submitted that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far.

Thus, in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that although the remaining witnesses are material, most of them are official witnesses.

5. Heard.

6. In view of the stage of trial and considering the fact that both the complainant and the injured have already been examined, this Court does not find any substantial reason to continue with the detention of the petitioner inside the jail.

Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case and keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances, the nature of injuries attributed to the petitioner, the period of incarceration already undergone, and the stage of trial, this Court deems it a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.



8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

However, it is clarified that in case, in future, any instance of issuance of threats to the complainant/victim or their family members is brought to the notice of this Court and is substantiated by material on record, it shall be open to the complainant/victim to seek cancellation of the bail granted to the petitioner in accordance with law.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

**March 16, 2026**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes/No

*Whether Reportable:* Yes/No