



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

**CRM-M-14364-2026 (O&M)  
DECIDED ON: 20.03.2026**

**NAND LAL@NANDU**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present: Mr. Akshit Mehta, Advocate and  
Mr. Shivam Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab.

**MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)**

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 303 dated 24.11.2024, registered under Section 103(1) of BNS-2023 (corresponding to Section 302 IPC) and Sections 190, 191(3), 61(2) of BNS-2023 (corresponding to Sections 149, 148, 120-B IPC), at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the present FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant Gurdeep Singh, who alleged that on the intervening night of 23/24.11.2024, his brother Chhinder Singh had left the house on his motorcycle and was later found admitted in Government Hospital, Sirsa. Upon reaching the hospital, the complainant noticed marks on the neck of the deceased, giving rise to suspicion of murder. It is the case of the prosecution that the deceased was strangled



and the dead body was thrown on the highway to give an impression of an accident. During investigation, the involvement of co-accused Suraj and the present petitioner came to light.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 03 months and 21 days and out of 33 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined till date and the trial is proceeding at a snail's pace. It is further submitted that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner except the allegation that he allegedly held the hands of the deceased during the incident.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has contested the present bail petition. It is submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner actively participated in the commission of the offence by holding the hands of the deceased, while co-accused Suraj strangled the neck of the deceased. Thereafter, both the accused threw the dead body on the highway in order to give it the colour of an accident. It is further submitted that the petitioner is an active participant in the commission of murder and the material witnesses are yet to be examined.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court finds no merit in the present petition. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and pertain to a heinous offence of murder. The specific role attributed to the petitioner, though limited to holding the hands of the deceased, cannot be termed as insignificant at this stage, as the same reflects active participation in facilitating the commission of the



offence. The manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, followed by an attempt to disguise it as an accident, indicates a premeditated act.

6. Further, the trial is still at a nascent stage as only two out of 33 prosecution witnesses have been examined and the material witnesses are yet to be examined. In such circumstances, releasing the petitioner on bail may adversely affect the prosecution case. The gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner and the stage of the trial do not persuade this Court to grant the concession of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the present petition for grant of regular bail is dismissed.

8. However, it is clarified that nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**20.03.2026**

*Poonam Negi*

**(MANDEEP PANNU)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned*

*Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*