



CRM-M-69873-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-69873-2025

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Navneesh @ Raju @ Navnis

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bahmani, Advocate for
Mr. Manpreet Singh Longia, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Bhavesh Ola, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.111 dated 16.09.2025, registered under Section 109 of BNS, 2023 (Section 124(1) of BNS, 2023 added at the time of presentation of challan), at Police Station Nurpur Bedi, District Rupnagar.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Suman. It was alleged that on 16.09.2025 at about 10-11 p.m., her husband Navnish set her on fire after pouring petrol. She was shifted to the hospital by her family members. Thus request was made to take legal action against the accused person. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 25.09.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 10.11.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition. Vide order dated



CRM-M-69873-2025

-2-

11.02.2026, the petitioner has been granted interim bail by this Court.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that dispute in the present case is matrimonial in nature. He submits that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant, namely, Suman. To buttress his arguments, he submits that after the registration of the FIR, both the husband and wife have resolved their inter-se dispute by way of compromise. He submits that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1 and she has not supported the case of the prosecution and hence, she has been declared hostile. He contends that the petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 11.02.2026 and he has not misused the same. He further contends that other prosecution witnesses i.e. PW-2 and PW-3 have also not supported the case of the prosecution. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner had poured petrol on the complainant and set her on fire. He submits that the petitioner is the main accused against whom offence under Section 109 BNS, 2023 has been attracted. He further contends that the compromise arrived between the parties has no legal sanctity. On instructions, he submits that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. Complainant is also present in person in Court. She has submitted before this Court that she is a house wife and there is no one else



CRM-M-69873-2025

-3-

in the family to earn. She also endorses the fact that the matter has been resolved between the parties.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute in the present case is matrimonial in nature. The complainant as well as two other prosecution witnesses appeared before the trial Court and they have not supported the case of the prosecution. The dispute as stated before this Court has been compromised between the parties. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has completed incarnation of 04 months & 20 days as on 16.02.2026. Custody certificate of the petitioner further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of 19 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined.

7. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 11.02.2026, is made absolute subject to his already furnished surety/bail bonds before the trial Court and the same shall be treated as alive till the final disposal of the trial. The petitioner is directed to keep on appearing before the trial Court as and when required to do so and also to comply with the direction of the trial Court given by it during the pendency of the trial.

8. Present petition stands allowed.

06.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No