



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

**CRM-M No.25454 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.05.2026**

Deepak

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Senior DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.325 dated 09.09.2023, under Sections 302, 148, 149, 427, 506, 120-B of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sonipat Sadar District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of Kuldeep. It was alleged that on 09.09.2023, his brother Mukesh had gone to shop of Sumit to buy gravel dust. At about 04:00 PM, he received a call from Monu that someone has shot brother of the complainant at Sumit's shop in his office. It was alleged that Sumit and Amit have taken brother of the complainant to FIMS Hospital, Sonipat in an injured condition. On which, the complainant immediately reached the said hospital and found his brother in the emergency ward in an injured condition. Brother of the complainant told him that he has an



outstanding commission of Rs.50,00,000/- with Surendra Badwasni for buying and selling property, due to which, the quarrel took place and he also threatened to kill him. It was submitted that the incident of firing shot upon Mukesh took place in the office of Sumit, where 10-12 boys came and asked about him and then after verifying, those boys fired shots upon Mukesh. Thereafter, Sumit, Amit got Mukesh admitted to the hospital where, during treatment, the doctors declared him dead. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. Thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement and resultantly, he was arrested on 10.11.2023. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 30.03.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner was named in the FIR however, he has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is not an admissible evidence. He has submitted that no fire-arm injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he was part of the unlawful assembly. He has submitted that statement of the material witnesses



including complainant-Kuldeep has been recorded, who has not supported the case of the prosecution and turned hostile. He thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She has submitted that during investigation, it was found that the petitioner was out of three persons, who was driving the Swift Desire Car and recovery of Swift Desire was effected at the instance of petitioner which further connects him with the occurrence and substantiates his involvement in the case. She has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender as two more cases have been registered against him. She thus, has submitted that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest and he has been arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. The case in hand pertains to murder of brother of complainant-Mukesh. Though, petitioner was not named in the FIR, however, recovery of Swift Desire Car used in the commission of the offence was effected at the instance of the present petitioner which further strengthens the complicity of the petitioner. Needless to say that the investigation is at its crucial stage. As submitted,



out of 29 prosecution witnesses, 10 witnesses have been examined and there are two more cases against the petitioner.

6. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail, at this stage. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

11.05.2026

m.sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No