




2026:PHHC:073163

CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026

-1-



219+226

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

CRM-M No.9201 of 2026

Sandeep Tyagi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.18557 of 2026

Manish @ Manish Dahiya

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Jeevanjot S. Kang, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-9201-2026.

Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate and
Mr. Randhir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-18557-2026.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.
2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of



2026:PHHC:073163

**CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026**

-2-



regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.222, dated 15.06.2025, under Sections 115, 191(2), 191(3), 225, 351(3), 49 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 (54) of Arms Act, 1959 and after investigation challan has been filed under Sections 115, 225, 351(3), 49, 308(2), 117, 111(2)(b), 110, 3(5) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Rajendra Park Gurugram, District Gurugram.

3. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Parvinder Kumar. It was alleged that on 14.06.2025, at about 01:45 P.M., when the complainant along with his colleagues, namely, Sunil and Devdutt were at work at the site of AIPL's company, they saw one black colour Thar without number suddenly came at the site and stopped. Manish Dhanapur (petitioner in CRM-M-18557-2026) and his colleague alighted from the vehicle and both were having revolvers in their hands. They threatened the complainant and in the meantime, 4-5 other persons alighted from the vehicle, who also were having iron rods in their hands. They started beating the complainant and his colleague, namely, Sunil with rods. Manish repeatedly saying to kill Sunil and thereafter, due to continuously beating, Sunil become unconscious. Manish (petitioner in CRM-M-18557-2026) while escaping, had taken out gold kara from Sunil's hand and his other colleagues had taken gold chain from the neck of the complainant and cash amounting to Rs.60,000/- from his pocket. They fled away from the spot while threatening that in this area only Sunil Dahiya @ Tota Bhai and Sandeep Tyagi (petitioner in CRM-M-



**CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026**

-3-



9201-2026) will work and they will not allow anyone to work. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against all the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, both the petitioners were arrested on 18.06.2025 and 10.08.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of the charges, the trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram declined the bail applications filed by both the petitioners vide orders dated 11.09.2025 and 26.11.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioners earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-55970-2025 and CRM-M-68493-2025, however the same were dismissed as not pressed vide separate orders dated 12.12.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present second petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner (in CRM-M-9201-2026) as well as learned counsel for the petitioner (in CRM-M-18557-2026) have contended before this Court that the petitioners have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. They have submitted that the alleged occurrence in the present case has taken place on 14.06.2025. They have submitted that the petitioner, namely, Sandeep Tyagi, has been alleged to be the conspirator whereas the petitioner,



**CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026**

-4-



namely, Manish @ Manish Dahiya, has been alleged to have theft of kada, which is an after thought. They have submitted that the ocular version is not medically corroborated. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 18.06.2025 and 10.08.2025. They have submitted that the petitioner, namely, Sandeep Tyagi, has no criminal antecedents whereas the petitioner, namely, Manish @ Manish Dahiya is involved in three other cases, however, he is on bail in all these cases. They have submitted that the challan has been presented and the charges have been framed, however, no witness has been examined so far. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. Separate status reports in both the petitions by way of an affidavit of Sukhbir, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West, Gurugram on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel in the Court and the same are taken on record.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners along with co-accused in a pre-planned manner had caused the injuries to the complainant as well as to Sunil. He has submitted that the petitioners were armed with revolver and iron rods. He has submitted that though the charges have been framed, however, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.



**CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026**

-5-



7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 14.06.2025. The petitioner, namely Manish @ Manish Dahiya, has been alleged to be conspirator whereas the petitioner, namely, Sandeep Tyagi, has been alleged to have the theft of kada. Out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. The petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 10.08.2025 and 18.06.2025. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioner, namely, Sandeep Tyagi, has suffered an incarceration of 08 months and 23 days whereas the petitioner, namely, Manish @ Manish Dahiya has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 19 days as on 09.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Sandeep Tyagi is not involved in any other case, whereas, the petitioner, namely, Manish @ Manish Dahita is involved in three other cases, however, he is on bail in all these cases.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.



2026:PHHC:073163

**CRM-M No.9201 of 2026;
CRM-M No.18557 of 2026**

-6-



10. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and all the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

11. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

11.05.2026

rittu

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No