



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

212

CRM-M-49255-2024

Date of decision: August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Salahuddin @ Sallu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Sarfraj Anjum Mor and Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocates  
for the complainant.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.**

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.301 dated 26.08.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 302, 506, 120-B of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Ferozpur Jhirka, District Nuh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to an alleged monetary dispute between the deceased-Liaqat and the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner had no role in the occurrence and has, therefore, been roped in with a *mala fide* intent.

3. It has been further submitted that some of the co-accused in the present FIR have already been enlarged on bail by the learned trial Court and, therefore, the petitioner may also be given similar relief. Learned counsel has pointed out that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.01.2024; the investigation stands completed as challan has been presented; and the trial is likely to take considerable time to

conclude with the 23 prosecution witnesses still remaining to be examined. A prayer has, therefore, been made to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while vehemently opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been argued, on instructions from ASI Krishan Kumar, that the petitioner is a prime accused, specifically named in the FIR (Annexure P-1) and is alleged to have inflicted *danda* blows on the head of the deceased and thereafter, with a deliberate intent, run a bolero vehicle over the victim, causing fatal injuries. It has been submitted that the case of the prosecution is founded upon direct eyewitness account, and the eyewitness, who is also the complainant, has fully supported the case of the prosecution during deposition before the trial Court, reiterating the specific role and overt acts attributed to the petitioner. Learned State counsel has further contended that the incident was not a spontaneous quarrel but a premeditated and brutal assault arising from a grudge over monetary transactions. The testimony of the eyewitness, as per the learned State counsel, is credible, consistent, and materially corroborated by other evidence collected during investigation. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has also pointed out about the petitioner's involvement in at least three other criminal cases registered against him under various provisions of IPC.

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

6. The gist of the allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1), lodged by the Ronish is that the deceased, father of the complainant, had a running account of outstanding dues against the

petitioner and his associates. On the evening of 25.08.2023, after repeated demands for payment, the petitioner allegedly threatened the deceased. Later that night, the accused persons, armed with *danda*, iron rods, and a firearm, intercepted the complainant and his father near a petrol pump. Co-accused Salim alias Bania allegedly struck the deceased on the head with a *danda*, causing him to fall. Thereafter, the petitioner is alleged to have declared his intent to kill and driven the Bolero vehicle over the deceased, and then reversed it, crushing the head of the deceased. The accused persons fled, and the deceased was taken to the hospital, where he was declared dead. The FIR also records a subsequent telephonic call by the petitioner to a mechanic, inquiring whether the deceased had died.

7. After giving my thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and on perusal of the material on record, the allegations against the petitioner are found to be *prima facie* grave and specific. The FIR and the statement of the eyewitnesses, who is also the complainant, attribute to the petitioner a deliberate act of running over the victim with a motor vehicle-conduct which *prima facie* reflects a brutal and premeditated assault.

8. The prosecution version finds immediate and consistent corroboration from the ocular testimony of the complainant, who, as per the learned State counsel, has stood firm during examination before the learned trial Court. At this stage, such evidence carries considerable weight in assessing the petitioner's entitlement to bail.

9. The argument of parity with co-accused already enlarged on bail is misplaced. The role of the petitioner, as alleged, is distinct, graver, and directly linked to the fatal injuries. The principle of parity is

not absolute and cannot be invoked when the roles of the accused are demonstrably different. The antecedents of the petitioner, involving multiple FIRs under the IPC, also cannot be ignored at this stage, as they lend weight to the contention made by the learned State counsel regarding his propensity for criminal conduct.

10. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

12. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025**

*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No