



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

233

CRM-M-25652-2025

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

Mubin @ Senti

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

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

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.0010 dated 14.01.2024, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 120-B IPC and Sections 25-27-25(1)(A)-54-59 of Arms Act, registered at P.S. Bhupani, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that On 14.01.2024, the accused Mubin @ Senti along with his co-accused, caused injuries to the brother of the complainant namely Ram Sevak while he was in his fields. The injured was admitted in the Asian Hospital, Sector 21-A, Faridabad but the doctor declared him brought dead. The petitioner was not named in the FIR. However, his name was figured on the disclosure statement of accused Gaurav.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that the charges are yet to be framed and trial is likely to take a long time for its conclusion.



The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 06 months and 14 days as under trial, therefore, petitioner be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 06 months and 14 days as under trial.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that charges are yet to be framed and trial is likely to take a long time, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

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 would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

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

**30.07.2025**

anil

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