



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

114

**CRM-M-67810-2025
Date of Decision: 21.04.2026**

NARESH**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Ramesh Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (439 of Cr.P.C), in case FIR No.165 dated 15.06.2025 under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sadar, Rohtak.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Dayanand, resident of Village Kiloī Khas, District Rohtak, who alleged that his son Satish (aged about 40 years), an agriculturist and habitual drinker, was consuming liquor on 15.06.2025 at a veterinary hospital along with the petitioner and 2-3 other persons. During a quarrel, they allegedly strangled Satish (son of the complainant) with a bed-sheet and fled from the spot.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated due to the finger prints found on the liquor bottles so recovered from the spot. He further submits that there is no direct or indirect evidence to connect the petitioner with alleged crime, and no recovery has been effected from the petitioner. It is also submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 17.06.2025, and therefore, prays for grant of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner; status report by way of an affidavit of Amit Bhatia, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police- Sadar, Member, Special Investigation Team, Gurugram and finger print examination and comparison report of the petitioner and the same are taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 01 day and is not involved in any other case.

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

6. A perusal of the fingerprint examination report reveals that the samples are either faint or smudged and do not exhibit sufficient ridge characteristics for proper identification.

7. Considering that the fingerprint examination report and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 1 day, is not involved in any other case, and that the trial has yet to commence and is likely to take considerable time to conclude, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.



Continued detention of the petitioner, in such circumstances, would not serve the ends of justice

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 bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

21.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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