



CRM-M-46127-2024

-1-

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

[101+217]

CRM-M-46127-2024(O&amp;M)

Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

VINOD @ DOCTOR @ VINOD SAGAR

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Mahir Sood, Advocate  
Mr. Abhishek Raj, Advocate,  
Mr. Arun William, Advocate and  
Mr. Harleen Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

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

**CRM-36034-2025**

The application seeking placing on record the documents mentioned therein, is allowed as prayed for.

**CRM-M-46127-2024**

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS (erstwhile Section 439 of Cr.P.C) in case FIR No.272 dated 03.11.1999, under Sections 394/397/34 of IPC (Section 302 IPC added later on) and Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dharuhera, District Rewari, Haryana.
2. The case of the prosecution is that three unknown persons fired gun shots at one Anil Nayyar and Satish Joshi and fled away after snatching the bag containing Rs.40,000/-. The FIR was registered on 03.11.1999, thereafter, Satish Joshi succumbed to his injuries and died on 21.11.1999. Thereafter, one



**CRM-M-46127-2024**

-2-

Narendra Singh and Satish @ Pawan @ Pappu Kumar faced the prosecution but have since been acquitted, vide judgment dated 18.08.2001, the present petitioner was arrested in this case and brought on probation warrants on 04.07.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has already undergone 14 months of custody as an under trial. It is also stated that the address of the petitioner has been wrongly mentioned in the case file and he has no knowledge of being involved in the said FIR.

4. Learned State counsel does not deny the aforesaid facts

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

6. Keeping in view the above and the fact that the petitioner has already undergone 14 months of custody as an under trial; the continuous detention 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 during the pendency of the trial.

7. 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 trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



**CRM-M-46127-2024**

-3-

8. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant/petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

**11.09.2025**

*Anjal*

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

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