



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M-53411-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.09.2025

Sanjay Yadav

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Manvender Rathi, Advocate;  
Mr. Ajeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant 4<sup>th</sup> petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.353 dated 03.08.2022, registered under Section(s) 302/365/201/202/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

2. The brief facts of the case as per the prosecution are extracted as under:-

*“That the present FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by one Ramod Kumar, who happens to be a relative of the deceased. It is alleged in the FIR that the complainant is employed at Sangam Plywood Factory, Rohad Bypass. His nephew, namely Ajit Singh, son of Satyender Narain, had been working at the shop of Sanjay Yadav*



*(petitioner herein), son of Bharat Singh. situated at Luhaheri Road, Naya Bans, for the last 8-9 years. The complainant used to visit his nephew from time to time. That on 01.08.2022, at about 4:30 p.m., while the complainant was going to meet his said nephew, he allegedly witnessed Sanjay Yadav, his servant Vikas, and two other boys assaulting his nephew Ajit with wooden sticks (dandas) near the shop of Sanjay Yadav, Out of fear, the complainant returned without intervening. That on 02.08.2022, the complainant went out of station in connection with his work. On 03.08.2022, he came to know that his nephew had died. Thereafter, he informed the said incident to another nephew, namely Birjesh Kumar. On the same date, i.e., 03.08.2022, the complainant Ramod Kumar submitted a written complaint to the police, on the basis of which the present FIR came to be registered. During the course of investigation, the accused persons named in the FIR, namely Sanjay Yadav, son of Bharat Singh, resident of Dhummanhera, District Najafgarh, Delhi, and Vikas, son of Ramavatar, resident of Bhanpur, District Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, were arrested. That subsequently, during further investigation on 07.09.2022, one Neeraj, son of Virendra, resident of Daulatpur, Police Station Chhawla, District Dwarka, Delhi, was arrested under Section 365 IPC. Thereafter, on 06.10.2022, another accused, namely Akash, son of Amarpal, resident of Ghumanhera, Police Station*



*Chhawla, District Dwarka, Delhi, was also arrested under Section 365 IPC.”*

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner alongwith other persons assaulted the deceased-Ajit. He contends that the deceased was working with the petitioner for the last 10 years and there was no enmity amongst them. He further contends that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of 03 years, 01 month and 17 days. He contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. He submits that only 14 out of the total 30 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts. She, however, contends that there is recovery of a *Danda* from the petitioner and that the parties had a dispute pertaining to a sum of Rs.15,000/- which had been borrowed by the deceased, but the same was not returned. She however does not dispute that the petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents and is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial and lack of criminal antecedents and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate



222

CRM-M-53411-2025 (O&amp;M)

concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.09.2025***Mangal Singh*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No