

2026:PHHC:035910



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-70915-2025 (O&M)

Akshay Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	06.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	11.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	11.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Kunal Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashit Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Abhinav Kansal, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the third petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 41 dated 29.01.2023, registered under Sections 307, 148, 149, 323, 379, 452 and 506 of IPC, Section 25 of the Arms Act (Sections 302, 325 and 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Murthal, District Sonipat. His first petition was

2026:PHHC:035910



dismissed as withdrawn on 13.01.2025 with liberty to file a fresh petition for interim bail on medical grounds. Thereafter, he filed another petition seeking interim bail on medical grounds, which too was dismissed by this Court on 05.03.2025.

2. As per the allegations, on 29.01.2023, on receipt of an information qua an altercation having taken place at village Buktawarpur and one Dheeraj and his mother Krishna Devi having sustained serious injuries and further that they were taken to hospital, a police party headed by Hari Om reached at the spot of occurrence. Eyewitness Om Parkash met the police party but did not record his statement. On the same day, a written complaint was submitted by Neeraj son of aforesaid Om Parkash alleging that in the morning of that day, he had gone to village Badoli, when his wife telephonically informed him that the petitioner along with other co-accused and two unknown persons had entered into their house. The petitioner was armed with an axe and his companions were also armed with different weapons. She told him that they were assaulting his brother Dheeraj and parents and they had sustained injuries. On receipt of this information, the complainant rushed to his house and found his brother and parents to be in injured condition. Initially, a case under Sections 148, 452, 323, 325, 307, 379, 506, 201 and 149 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Victim Dheeraj succumbed to his injuries on 30.01.2023. Post-mortem examination of the dead body of the victim and inquest proceedings were conducted. Offence under Section 302 of IPC was added.

3. As per the further allegations, the petitioner and co-accused

2026:PHHC:035910



Surender @ Nishu were arrested on 04.09.2023. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. Co-accused Surender @ Nishu got recovered a country made pistol of .32 bore, which was used by the present petitioner in the incident and was handed over to co-accused Surender @ Nishu after commission of crime. Other co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed. The petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No specific injury or role has been attributed to him. No recovery has been effected from him. He is not even seen in the CCTV footage of the occurrence. The petitioner is in custody for a period of over 02 years and 07 months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Material witness Om Parkash already stands examined and there are no chances of the petitioner's intimidating him or misusing the concession of bail. Co-accused Mohit has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 12.11.2025 passed in **CRM-M-21627-2025**. Hence, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has strongly opposed the present petition on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature. It is argued that the petitioner had joined the unlawful assembly along with the co-accused and, in furtherance of the common object of the said assembly, actively participated in the occurrence

2026:PHHC:035910



by assaulting the victims. It is further submitted that the injuries sustained by Dheeraj ultimately proved fatal. Other persons also suffered serious injuries, including the mother of the deceased, who received five injuries that were opined to be dangerous to life. It is argued that PW Om Parkash has supported the prosecution case. There is also an apprehension that, if released on bail, the petitioner may abscond or attempt to influence or intimidate the material witnesses. It is further submitted that even on the principle of vicarious liability, the petitioner's involvement in the crime is *prima facie* made out. On these grounds, dismissal of the petition has been prayed for.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made by both the sides.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, injuries were caused to victims Dheeraj and his mother Krishna Devi. Injuries sustained by victim Dheeraj were proved to be fatal and resulted into his death, whereas victim Krishna had also sustained five injuries which have been declared to be dangerous to life. The petitioner is alleged to be armed with an axe and to have caused serious injuries on the victims. As per disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Surender @ Nishu, the petitioner was also armed with a pistol, which he had handed over to him after the incident. The said pistol was got recovered by co-accused Surender @ Nishu. The allegations *prima facie* reveal active participation of the petitioner in the incident. The petitioner has also been linked to the acts attributed with the aid of Section 149 of IPC. The essential ingredients of this offence are that:

i. There must be an unlawful assembly;

2026:PHHC:035910



- ii. Commission of an offence may be by any member of the unlawful assembly; and
- iii. Such offence must have been committed in prosecution of the common object of the assembly, or must be such as the members of the assembly knew to be likely to be committed.

8. From a perusal of the above ingredients, it is apparent that even mere presence in the unlawful assembly but with an active mind to achieve the common object, makes a person vicariously liable for the acts of the unlawful assembly. Under Section 149 of IPC, the liability of the other members, for the offence committed during the continuance of the occurrence rests upon the fact whether the other members knew beforehand that the offence actually committed was likely to be committed in prosecution of the common object. Such knowledge may reasonably be collected from the nature of the assembly, arms, or behaviour at or before the scene of action.

9. In the instant case, the petitioner along with the co-accused had entered into the house of deceased victim and had opened an attack upon him as well as his parents, which *prima facie* shows the common object of the members of the assembly including the petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he along with the co-accused stands accused of a heinous crime punishable with capital punishment or life imprisonment. Mere non-appearance of the petitioner in the CCTV footage does not absolve him from the allegations or prove his non-involvement in the incident. Even otherwise, the same is a matter of trial. The deceased victim is reported to have sustained 41 external injuries on his person, whereas his mother had received five injuries which were found to be

2026:PHHC:035910



dangerous to life. While length of incarceration is a factor that weighs with the Court in considering bail, it cannot overshadow the seriousness of the accusation of murder under Section 302 of IPC. There exists a genuine apprehension that his release may imperil the course of trial and undermine the integrity of the trial and could pose a risk by influencing unexamined witnesses or tampering with evidence. The petitioner cannot claim parity with co-accused Mohit as his case was on different footing. It is well-settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the complainant is also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. The well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody is not sufficient ground for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in ***Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242 and State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)***. In light of the foregoing legal principles, and having regard to the petitioner's role in the incident, the recovery of the weapon of offence at his instance and the reasonable apprehension of his absconding or tampering with evidence,

2026:PHHC:035910



this Court finds no compelling ground to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

10. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

11.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No