

2026:PHHC:006831



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

231

CRM-M No.61096 of 2025
Date of Decision: 19.01.2026

Narender alias Bhanu ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
601	12.09.2016	Hisar Civil Lines, District Hisar	302, 392, 111, 120-B, 34, 202, 212 and 201 of IPC and 25 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Akhil Bansal alleging that on the evening of 12.09.2016, on receipt of a telephonic information to the effect that his brother Sachin had been shot at by someone in the Town

2026:PHHC:006831



Park, he along with his mother has rushed there. Geetika wife of his brother met them there and disclosed that she along with the victim had come to the Town Park on their I-20 car. At about 9:30-10 PM, when they were proceeding back and were sitting in their vehicle, then suddenly one youth while carrying pistol had fired a shot upon the victim Sachin thereby causing injury on this head. Her husband had fallen out from the vehicle. She rushed for rescuing him and then the assailants fired two more shots. He thereafter sat in the vehicle of the victim and tried to crush over her husband. On clamour being raised, the assailants fled in their vehicle. She also disclosed that she could identify the assailant. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of dead body of the victim was conducted. During the course of investigation, accused Pawan was arrested. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also that the petitioner along with the co-accused Rohit Punia had hatched a plan to snatch a good conditioned vehicle with the help of accused Pawan and to use that vehicle for committing offence of robbery. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 11.09.2017. He too suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he had hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and also that he had caused disappearance of blood stained clothing, shoes and weapons by throwing the same in canal. The petitioner was extended benefit of bail on 13.12.2017. He absconded thereafter and was declared a proclaimed person on 05.01.2019. He was arrested on 05.08.2020 and is in custody since then.

2026:PHHC:006831



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He had been extended benefit of bail as he was neither named in the FIR nor there was any direct incriminating evidence against him. Now continuously, he is in custody since 05.08.2020. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. PW Geetika who was the most material witness has not implicated him in commission of the subject crime. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused for committing the offence of robbery by snatching some vehicle and in pursuance of that conspiracy, the co-accused are alleged to have fired shot at the victim and snatched his vehicle. The petitioner had previously been extended benefit of bail but was declared a proclaimed person subsequently. No doubt, he is in custody since long. However, as intimated by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana now the trial has completed since all the prosecution witnesses stand examined. The case before the trial



Court is at the stage of producing defence evidence. As such, it cannot be stated that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. Taking into consideration this fact, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for allowing the petition is made out. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

19.01.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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