

2026:PHHC:009722



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

215

CRM-M-60595-2025
Date of Decision: 22.01.2026

NEERAJ

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Prateek Rathee, Mr. Shwas Bajaj and
Mr. Ashutosh Singh, Advocates for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.401 dated 19.10.2021 under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (later on Section 34 of IPC was deleted and Sections 120-B of IPC and Sections 27 and 29 of the Arms Act, 1959 were added) registered at Police Station Rewari City, District Rewari, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that some unknown persons came on motorcycle and scooty and shot dead the son of the complainant. It is stated that during investigation, sufficient evidence was found against the present petitioner and as such, he has been arrested in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that allegations against the petitioner are general and vague. He has been implicated in the present case solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by his co-accused Narender @ Ninder, who was in police custody. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than four years and two months. It is further stated that charges against the petitioner have been framed, however, out of 51 cited witnesses, only 36 have been examined till date.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that there is an active role of the petitioner in the commission of the offence in question. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate has been filed by the State Counsel, which is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than four years and two months.

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

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than four years and two months and the trial against the petitioner might take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

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

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

JANUARY 22, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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