



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

147

CRM-M-62869-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.03.2026

Kunal

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.331 dated 05.08.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 346, 201, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25/29 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Israna, District Panipat Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 08.08.2023 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 02 years and 07 months. He contends that total 04 persons were nominated as accused by the complainant-Karambir Singh (father of deceased) in the present case, however, one of them, i.e. Dxxx was juvenile. It is submitted that the case is based on circumstantial evidence where motive rests with co-accused Aman as deceased Rinku was suspected to be in a relationship with the sister of the said co-accused. It is also submitted that the prosecution has not completed its evidence despite the custody of more than 02 years 07 months of the petitioner herein.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from Investigating Officer, however, contends that the prosecution evidence is nearing completion as out of 28 witnesses, 24 already stand examined and only 04 remain to be examined. He further contends that next date before the trial Court is 22.04.2026 for remaining prosecution evidence, and in case, the evidence of prosecution is not completed on the said date, the prosecution shall conclude its evidence affirmatively within a period of 03 months of the date next fixed before the trial Court for recording of the remaining prosecution evidence.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with their able assistance.

5. Taking into consideration the fact that the prosecution evidence is nearing completion and that the respondent-State has undertaken to complete recording of the prosecution evidence, I am of the opinion that there is no valid foundation for concluding that the custody has been unnecessarily prolonged and the prosecution has failed to take effective steps to conclude its evidence.

6. Faced with the above, counsel for the petitioner does not wish to press the present petition at this stage.

7. Disposed of as not pressed.

8. The prosecution shall, however, remain bound to conclude the evidence within the time frame undertaken as above.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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