



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

212

CRA-S-1868-2025 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision : 03.07.2025

**DALJEET**

... Petitioner

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA**

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Nitesh Singhi, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**

1. This is an appeal for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in FIR No.252 dated 16.10.2021 under Sections 302, 34 IPC and 3(2)(V) SC/ ST Act registered at Police Station Pillu Khera, District Jind.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a blind murder had taken place of one Hari Om @ Dholu who had injuries and strangulation mark on his neck. Thereafter, the petitioner in the present case has been implicated on the basis of last seen with the deceased. Apart from the disclosure statement of the Ram Mehar, who has also been given up by the prosecution, one *parna* has also been recovered from the place of occurrence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was arrested on 25.11.2021 and has undergone custody for a period of more than 03



and a half years. He further contends that out of 26 prosecution witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 06 have been examined so far.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 02.07.2025 and states that the petitioner has undergone the custody period of 03 years, 07 months and 05 days. However, he does not refute the fact that out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 08 have been examined so far. He also states that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. The present case is based on circumstantial evidence. Further, the last seen and recovery of one *parna* from the place of alleged crime, is the only evidence so far in the present case. Moreover, witness namely Ram Mehar who is stated to have last seen the deceased with the petitioner and other co-accused, has also been given up by the prosecution.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that custody period undergone by the petitioner in the present case is 03 years, 07 months and 05 days and further that the petitioner has clean antecedents, therefore, no useful purpose would be served to further detain the petitioner in jail and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.



7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

**03<sup>rd</sup> July, 2025**

*Sonia Puri*

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

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No