



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

CRM-M-42617-2025

Date of Decision:-02.09.2025

Amit @ Patwari.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singh, AAG Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.154 dated 02.08.2024 under Sections 103(1), 3(5), 54 BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sadar Rewri, District Rewari

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Nakul Yadav and reads as under:-

“ To, The Station House Officer, Police Sadar, the Rewari (Haryana).
Subject: Regarding the murder of my elder brother Rahul Yadav. Sir, is requested that I, Nakul Yadav son of late Sh. Bharat Yadav, am the resident of Dhani of village Jatusana. I had gone to Haridwar for bringing the Kavad. On 01.08.2024, after taking Kavad when reached near the Police station Jatusana, then the son of my uncle and the son of my aunt namely Sachin son of Sumer Singh, Vicky son of Lakshman Singh told me on the way that my brother Rahul has met with an accident. He is admitted in Matrika Hospital. When I alongwith my family members reached the hospital then it came to know that Amit Patwari son of Ramphal, village Lalod, Rewari, Haryana and his friend have hit his car



CRM-M-42617-2025 #2#

SUV-300 (colour black) at Daksh Prajapati Chowk and killed him. Sir, the murder of my brother is due to the enmity. Action be taken against them and after arresting them, strict action be taken. The eye witness of this incident is Parveen son of Mahender Singh, village Lala, Police station Jatusana, Rewari who was with my brother at the time of accident. Appropriate strict action be taken and the accused be arrested at the earliest. Thanking You, Applicant Sd/- Nakul Yadav."

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the taking the allegations to be correct, the petitioner was only sitting along with the main accused Dhillu who is stated to have run over the deceased. Two similarly situated co-accused namely Madan Pal and Anipal Singh @ Foji have been granted the concession of bail vide orders dated 04.08.2025 in CRM-M-40387-2025 and 09.07.2025 in CRM-M-58683-2024 respectively. As the petitioner is in custody since 04.08.2024, but none of the 32 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State on the other hand contends that the vehicle used in the occurrence was owned by the petitioner. He along with other 04 accused were travelling in the said vehicle though the same was being driven by co-accused Dhillu. Looking at the nature of the allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. However, he concedes that two similarly situated co-accused Madan Pal and Anipal Singh @ Foji have been granted the concession of bail as also the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 04.08.2024 and none of the 32 Pws has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the trial.



CRM-M-42617-2025 #3#

Admittedly, the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 04.08.2024 and none of the 32 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, his further incarceration is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Amit @ Patwari** son of Sh. Ramphal is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.

9. If the petitioner or any of his family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this Court.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from the trial without sufficient cause.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

September 02, 2025

Vinay

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>