

2026:PHHC:026907



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

118

CRM-M-65066-2025
Date of Decision: 19.02.2026

LADEN

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.0035 dated 28.01.2025, under Sections 127(6) of the BNS, 2023 (Sections 140(1), 238(1), 103(1) and 3(5) added later on) registered at P.S. Sadar Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the present petitioner alongwith his co-accused had made an extra-judicial confession before one Bhoop Singh, the former Sarpanch of village Kajal Heri to the effect that they had intoxicated their uncle namely Subhash, inflicted injuries on his body and killed him. Thereafter, they disposed of the dead body in the Rajasthan Canal. The said confession was recorded on 04.02.2025 and thereafter, the dead body was recovered from the area of Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that apart from the said extra-judicial confession allegedly made by the petitioner and his other co-accused persons as well as the disclosure statement made by them in police custody, there is no evidence on record to connect the petitioner with alleged offence. He further submits that the co-accused Ritik, who is similarly situated accused, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 09.12.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-63575-2025. He further submits that

challan has been presented and charges have been framed, however, no witness has been examined till date. The petitioner is in custody for the last approximately two years, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and is assisted by Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate who has already appeared on behalf of the complainant. They vehemently oppose the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the role attributed to the petitioner is specific and serious. Learned State Counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 11 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 01 year and 11 months and coupled with the fact that co-accused Ritik has already been released on bail, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the 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, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail 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 indulging 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.

FEBRUARY 19, 2026.

Rajender

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

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No