



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

229

CRM-M-2442-2025

Date of decision: April 29th, 2025

Satyavir

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Subhash Chand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

The Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.85 dated 22.03.2022 under Sections 302, 201, 392 of the IPC registered at Police Station Mundkati, District Palwal, on the ground of his prolonged custody and alleged false implication.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.04.2022, and the case is based purely on circumstantial evidence. The petitioner was not named in the FIR, and no specific role was initially attributed to him. It is also contended that material witnesses have already been examined and, therefore, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose, particularly in the absence of any apprehension of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently

opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by submitting that the present case involves a grave offence of murder, wherein Sunil (hereinafter referred to as 'deceased'), a taxi driver, was found dead in a field with a noose around his neck. The FIR in question (Annexure P-1) was registered against unknown persons. During the course of investigation, the identity of the deceased was subsequently established through a photograph and personal belongings, including shoes, by his son.

4. It came to light during investigation that the petitioner, along with his two co-accused, had hired the taxi of the deceased and, thereafter, allegedly murdered him, disposed of his body in a field, and fled with the taxi, which was later recovered abandoned at Hathras, U.P. On further instructions, it has been contended that the mobile handset of the deceased was recovered from the petitioner, and the PAN and Aadhaar Card etc. of the deceased were recovered from the co-accused. It has still further been submitted, on instructions, that the dump data of mobile phone used near the site of the recovery of the body and CCTV footage from the toll plaza nail the accused including the petitioner in the crime in question and corroborate the investigative findings, placing the petitioner and co-accused in proximity to the scene of crime.

5. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court, on instructions, that the wife of the deceased stated before the police that shortly before his disappearance, her husband had

spoken to her over the phone and disclosed that he was going to Agra with the petitioner and others.

6. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has submitted that the motive for the crime was robbery, and that the petitioner participated in the murder with the intent to loot the taxi and personal belongings of the deceased.

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

8. The case at hand is based on circumstantial evidence. No doubt, no suspicion was raised regarding the involvement of the petitioner in the murder of the deceased. However, the statement of the wife of the deceased, coupled with the CCTV evidence showing the taxi crossing the toll plaza, provides strong *prima facie* material connecting the petitioner to the crime in question.

9. It is not in dispute that the trial is at an advanced stage, with only formal witnesses remaining to be examined. Further, considering the serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, recovery of incriminating material from his possession, corroborative electronic and testimonial evidence, and the gravity of the offence, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of bail at this stage.

10. The possibility of the petitioner absconding or evading the due process of law, if released on bail, cannot be ruled out in the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

12. However, keeping in view the long incarceration period of the petitioner, the trial Court shall make earnest efforts to expedite the trial and conclude it at the earliest preferably within the next four months.

13. 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.

April 29th, 2025

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No