



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

2026:PHHC:073200



Reserved on: 18.04.2026.
Date of decision: 11.05.2026.
Uploaded on: 12.05.2026.

Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or the full judgment is pronounced.	Operative part/full judgment
--	-------------------------------------

(1)

CRM-M-32815-2025

ARUN GARG

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-50119-2025

TUSHAR GARG

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-2-2026:PHHC:073200

(3)

CRM-M-60478-2025

MANISH MITTAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(4)

CRM-M-60874-2025

VIJAY DUTT @ GOOGLE PANDIT

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(5)

CRM-M-61848-2025

SAHIL SHARMA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(6)

CRM-M-60417-2025

GARAV @ GARV

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent



(7)

CRM-M-68299-2025

TUSHAR GARG

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

(8)

CRM-M-8397-2026

MEER KASIM

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Yajur Monga, Mr. Saurabh Sharma and Mr. Ankur Mehta, Advocates and Mr. Yajur Mago, Advocate for the petitioner(s) in **CRM-M-60874-2025, CRM-M-60417-2025 & CRM-M-61848-2025.**

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Bhavi Kapur, Advocates for the petitioner in **CRM-M-68299-2025.**

Mr. Deepender Singh, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Nipun Gupta and Mr. Mayank Sarpal, Advocates, for the petitioner in **CRM-M-60478-2025.**

Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate with Mr. Gurdeep Grewal, Advocate and Mr. Poorvi Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner in **CRM-M-32815-2025.**

Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Raghav Agnihotri, Advocate, and



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-4-2026:PHHC:073200

Mr. Raahat Kataria, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-50119-2025.

Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
in CRM-M-8397-2026.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana assisted by
Sub Inspector Hardev Singh.

Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate
for injured/eye-witness.

Mr. Brijender Kaushik, Advocate with
Mr. Nitin Katoria, Advocate
for the complainant/injured witness.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.

These eight regular bail petitions, arising out of the same FIR No.26 dated 25.01.2025 registered under Section 103(1), 109(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 61(2) of the BNS was added later on) at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala, are being decided by a common order.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Sudarshan Singh (uncle of deceased Harbilas).

FACTS

3. As per version of the prosecution, an information was received on 24.01.2025 to the effect that 4/5 persons have fired upon Harbilas Rajjumajra (deceased), Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit (Petitioner-accused herein). The injured persons were taken to the Hospital in private vehicles. Thereafter, the police officials reached at the spot and the crime scene was secured after dispersing the crowd. Sudarshan Singh son of Ajmer Singh resident of Village Husaini, Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala got recorded his statement to the effect that



Harbilas son of Surjeet Singh resident of Village Rajjumajra is his nephew and that the families are close to each other. He submitted that Harbilas owned cultivable land and had also built a marriage palace under the name and style of 'Radhey Farm' near village Rajjumajra. Additionally, he also used to deal in properties alongwith one Puneet Dang @ Chunnu resident of Village Dehar, District Ambala. About three years ago Puneet Dang @ Chunnu son of Amarnath had purchased a 95 marla plot near Chawla Palace, Naraingarh from one Ajay Garg resident of Naraingarh. At that point in time, an agreement to Sell for the plot was written and later Harbilas had purchased that plot from Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. The entire sale consideration had been paid by Harbilas to Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. However, on account of cordial relations between the parties, Ajay Garg had not got the sale deed registered in the name of Harbilas. Eventually, the owners of the plot in question namely Ajay Garg showed reluctance in executing the sale deed as the prices of the plot had escalated during the intervening period. For the last 4/5 months, negotiations were ongoing between the parties to resolve the dispute. In order to settle the matter, it was orally agreed between the parties that Harbilas would pay an additional amount of Rs. 1.75 crores towards the escalation in the value of the land, to Ajay Garg, whereafter the sale deed was to be executed. During the course of the said negotiations, Ajay Garg had introduced one Manish Mittal who conveyed that an additional amount of Rs. 1.75 crores be handed over to Venkat Garg son of Avinash Garg, a family member of Ajay Garg and that the amount would be released to Ajay Garg after finalization of the deal. It was represented that Venkat Garg would be responsible for getting the sale deed of plot registered in the name of Harbilas failing which the amount



shall be returned by Venkat Garg and that he (Manish Mittal) stood guarantee for the said amount. Relying upon the said assurance, Harbilas handed over the amount of Rs. 1.75 crores, in cash, to Venkat Garg but despite having received the additional amount, the sale deed of the plot was not got registered in the name of Harbilas. Harbilas and Puneet Dang were continuously in touch with Ajay Garg and Munish Mittal and told them that since money had already been received by them, either they should get the sale deed registered or return the money. A meeting was also held on the 24.01.2025.

4. It is further alleged that the said Ajay Garg and Venkat Garg orchestrated the attack upon Harbilas so as to retain the money as well as the property. It is further stated that on the same day, at about 5:30 pm, Harbilas, Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandat proceeded in a car bearing registration No. HR-04K-9000 to collect their money from Venkat Garg. They were initially called near the telephone exchange and were thereafter directed to different locations including near Anu Lab & subsequently near Kheda and finally towards Nawab Jassa Singh Ahluwalia Park, Naraingarh. When they reached the said place, 4-5 unidentified assailants opened fire upon them, with an intention to kill. Harbilas succumbed to the injuries while Puneet Dang received injuries, thus leading to the registration of present FIR.

ARGUMENTS IN GENERAL AND COMMON TO ALL THE PETITIONER(S)

5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contend that even though as per the version contained in the FIR, an agreement to Sell had been executed between Ajay Garg and Puneet Dang



@ Chunnu, however, the said fact is factually incorrect inasmuch as the agreement to Sell had been entered into with respect to 94 marlas of land @ Rs. 4.11 per lakhs per marla (totaling to Rs. 3.86 crore plus a plot then valued at Rs. 66 lakhs), on 30.05.2022 between Harbilas and Anju Garg wife of Ajay Garg. The target date for execution of the sale deed was 10.09.2022. The payable sale consideration was settled at Rs. 3.86 crores, out of which Rs. 2.92 crores had been paid to Anju Garg and Ajay Garg by Harbilas through the banking channels as well as in cash. As the sale deed was not executed by the said date, the time period was extended by a mutual understanding of the parties.

6. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) refer to the Status report that has been filed by way of an affidavit of Suraj Chawla, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Naraingarh, District Ambala dated 13.01.2026 and contend that Venkat Garg was subsequently introduced into the transaction as it was represented that the sale deed with respect to the aforesaid land could not be executed without his intervention and mediation. Since the execution of the sale deed was being delayed. Petitioner-accused Munish Mittal was brought in for mediating a settlement. It is further submitted that Negotiations towards resolution of the dispute continued in 2024, wherein an oral agreement was arrived at. As per the same, an additional amount of Rs. 1.75 crores was agreed to be paid towards escalation. Manish Mittal had asked Harbilas to hand over the additional amount, in an escrow, to Venkat Garg which was to be released to Ajay Garg and Anju Garg only upon execution of the sale deed. In the event the sale deed is not executed, the amount shall be returned to Harbilas. They further contend that as per the case set up by the prosecution, Manish Mittal



had agreed to stand as a guarantor for the said amount in the event Venkat Garg did not return the same. They submit that notwithstanding the same, it is also the case set up by the prosecution-complainant that the sale deed was still not executed as a result whereof further negotiations were held and an oral agreement was entered into on 22.01.2025 i.e. three days before the incident, wherein it was agreed that instead of executing the sale deed with respect to 94 marlas of land, the sale deed shall be executed for an area measuring 50 marlas and that the amount of Rs. 1.75 crores held with Venkat Garg, in escrow, shall be returned alongwith a further sum of Rs. 1.20 crores to be returned by Anju Garg and Ajay Garg.

7. Learned Counsel contend that it was in the said background that the present incident of 2025 is alleged to have been orchestrated by the petitioner(s)/accused persons so as to not only retain the said money but also to retain the property with their own self.

8. Learned Counsel for the petitioner(s) further contend that, upon completion of investigation, the police nominated as many as 22 persons as accused in the present case. Out of the said 22 persons, one person namely Sagar Kashyap who was amongst the persons who fired shots, has been killed in an encounter and the remaining 21 persons have been sent up to face trial. It is further contended that, as per the prosecution case, five persons namely Gagan, Shivam, Vicky Malik, Sagar Kashyap and Rajan were the alleged shooters. They further contend that initially 08 persons were named in the FIR, the same being Ajay Garg son of Ved Parkash, Anju Garg wife of Ajay Garg, Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg, Arun Garg son of Amrit Lal, Venkat Garg son of Avinash Garg, Sahil Sharma son of Rajesh Kumar, Manish Mittal @ Chiku son of Gian Chand and Nihal Garg son of



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-9-2026:PHHC:073200

Ajay Garg. They further contend that aforesaid Nihal Garg son of Ajay Garg was found to be innocent during investigation. It is further submitted that as many as 17 persons have been nominated as accused with the aid of Section 120-B i.e. criminal conspiracy. They further contend that the charges in the present case were framed on 09.02.2026 where after the material witnesses i.e. the injured witnesses and the eye witnesses as well as the complainant already stand examined. They further submit that the dates of respective arrest of the petitioner are tabulated as under: -

Sr. No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioner	Date of arrest
1.	CRM-M-32815-2025	Arun Garg	26.01.2025
2.	CRM-M-50119-2025	Tushar Garg	31.01.2025
3.	CRM-M-60478-2025	Munish Mittal @ Chiku	26.01.2025
4.	CRM-M-60874-2025	Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit	31.01.2025
5.	CRM-M-61848-2025	Sahil Sharma	26.01.2025
6.	CRM-M-60417-2025	Garav @ Garv	25.04.2025
7.	CRM-M-68299-2025	Tushar Garg	04.05.2025
8.	CRM-M-8397-2026	Meer Kasim	22.07.2025



9. Learned Counsel for the petitioner(s) further refer to the criminal antecedents of the accused which had been mentioned by the prosecution in its status report. The same are tabulated as under: -

S. No.	Name of the accused-petitioner	Criminal antecedents, if any
1.	Manish Mittal @ Chiku son of Gian Chand.	NIL
2.	Sahil Sharma son of Rajesh Kumar Sharma	NIL
3.	Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg	NIL
4.	Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit son of Om Parkash Sharma	NIL
5.	Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg	NIL
6.	Arun Garg son of Amrit Lal	1. FIR No. 147 dated 18.05.2012 u/s G Act, PS Naraingarh. 1. FIR No. 93 dated 25.03.2012 u/s G Act, PS Naraingarh. 1. FIR No. 34 dated 17.01.2022 u/s HDR Act, PS Naraingarh.
7.	Garv @ Garav son of Sanjeev Kumar	FIR No. 84 dated 21.03.2025 u/s 257, 324(4), 324(5), 308(5), 111(3) BNS & 25-54-59 Arms Act, PS Naraingarh.

10. They further contend that only 06 out of 69 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far. The conclusion of trial shall thus take long. They further contend that the petitioners have been nominated as accused solely on the basis of disclosure statements of the co-accused, recorded by the prosecution, while they were in custody, which such disclosure statement is actually inadmissible in view of Section 25 of the Evidence Act (Section 23(1), BSA). Learned Counsel further contend that



there are material contradictions in the version of the prosecution, as reflected in the status report filed. On the one hand, the case of the prosecution is that the offence was orchestrated by a group, with a premediated motive to not execute the sale deed or return the money already taken, on the other hand, it is alleged that there had been an altercation between Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and Venkat Garg in July, 2024 wherein Puneet Dang had orchestrated an attack upon Venkat Garg, in which both his legs and arms were fractured and owing to this, Venkat Garg developed a grudge against the complainant party and planned the attack.

ARGUMENTS IN GENERAL BY THE RESPONDENT(S)

11. Learned State Counsel on the other hand contends that while the agreement *inter se* the complainant party as well as the accused herein and the stages of mediation/conciliation that took place amongst them is not disputed, it transpired that the accused party had executed an agreement with the complainants and had received a substantial share of the sale consideration. It is submitted that thereafter, accused persons got greedy and intended to usurp the entire money and also not execute the sale deed. It was in the said circumstances that they planned the attack. She further contends that although Harbilas, Puneet Dang @ Chunnu @ Chunnu and Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit were travelling together in the Innova, however, it transpired during investigation that Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit was in collusion with the accused persons and was constantly in touch with them and he shared the location. He thus brought the victims to the place where the assailants were already waiting for them so as to open the attack. Accordingly, Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit was also nominated as an accused in the present case. It is further submitted that disclosure statements of the



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-12-2026:PHHC:073200

accused have been recorded. The details and the circumstances in which respected accused have been nominated in the FIR and the evidence collected against them as well as the recovery effected from each of them has been tabulated in the status report which reads thus: -

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Name and parentage of the accused persons</i>	<i>Date of arrest if already inside the Jail</i> <i>* On bail</i> <i>* Date of dismissal of bail</i> <i>* Hon'ble Courts details</i>	<i>How nominated as an accused</i> <i>* Named in complaint/FIR</i> <i>* On the basis of secret information</i> <i>* On the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused</i> <i>* Evidence collected against the accused</i>	<i>Recovery if any effected</i>	<i>Previous criminal back ground if any</i>
1.	<i>Arun Kumar Garg</i> <i>CRM-M-32815-2025</i>	26.01.2025 Now in Judicial Custody	<i>That the accused-petitioner Arun Garg was also part of the entire nexus and was pursuing all the cases of Venkat Garg actively and there is absolutely nothing to show that relations between Venkat Garg and either of the accused-petitioner were strained.</i> <i>That as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Sahil Sharma, who was deployed for recce of Chunnu Dang and Harbilas resident Rajju Majra also disclosed that he</i>	<i>Nil</i> <i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-5</i>	<i>1. FIR No. 147 dated 18.05.2012 u/s G Act, PS Naraingarh.</i> <i>1. FIR No. 93 dated 25.03.2012 u/s G Act, PS Naraingarh.</i> <i>3. FIR No. 34 dated 17.01.2022 u/s HDR Act, PS Naraingarh.</i>



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-13-2026:PHHC:073200

			<i>used to give all the information about them (Harbilas (since deceased and Chunnu Dang) to Venkat Garg, Ajay Garg, Arun Kumar, Manish Mittal, Anju Garg and their two sons.</i>		
2.	<i>Tushar Garg son of Avinash Kumar Garg, Resident of House No. 320 Ward No.7, Jogiya Wala Mohalla, Naraingarh, Distt. Ambala, Haryana</i> <i>CRM-M-50119-2025</i>	<i>31.01.2025 Now in Judicial custody</i>	<i>Accused Tushar Garg, son of Avinash Garg, is the real brother of main accused Venkat Garg, wanted in the case. He was involved in the conspiracy of Manish Mittal not returning Rs. 1 crore 75 lakh 50 thousand given to accused Venkat Garg and Anju Garg not getting the plot registered. He, in connivance with the accused, hatched a conspiracy and gave information to his brother Venkat Garg by doing recce of Harbilas Singh. and Punit Dang. He, along with the aforementioned accused, fired bullets at Harbilas and Punit Dang with the intention of killing them. In which Harbilas died and Punit Dang was injured.</i> <i>* After this incident, on</i>	<i>NIL The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-7</i>	<i>NIL</i>



			<p>29.01.2025, the accused called the main accused Venkat Garg more than 15 times through WhatsApp but did not get any response from the other side. That as far as evidence against the present accused-petitioner Tushar Garg concerned is that he played a vital role and that allegations are serious and grave in nature and was also part of the entire nexus and money transaction were there between petitioner/accused Tushar and Venkat Garg who used to stay in the same house.</p> <p>That as far as evidence against the present accused-petitioner Tushar Garg concerned is that he played a vital role and that allegations are serious and grave in nature and was also part of the entire nexus and money transaction were there between petitioner/accused Tushar and Venkat Garg who used to stay in the same</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--



			<p>house.</p> <p><i>*That petitioner/accused Tushar was used to give the location details of the deceased Harbilas to his brother Venkat and used to make available funds for him and managed everything on the ground for the commission of present crime.</i></p> <p><i>* That the accused-petitioner was very much involved in the conspiracy and commission of present crime in connivance with co-accused persons and there is prima facie evidence on the case file against the accused-petitioner in shape of statements of injured for his involvement in the commission of present crime.</i></p>		
3.	<p><i>Manish Mittal @ Chiku son of Gian Chand, Resident of Flat No. 101, GH 54, Sector 20, Panchkula Haryana</i></p> <p><i>CRM-M-</i></p>	<p><i>26.01.2025</i></p> <p><i>Now in judicial custody</i></p>	<p><i>Accused Manish Mittal was in collusion with the co-accused Ajay Kumar son of Vedprakash, Arun Kumar Garg son of late Amrit Lal Garg, Anju Garg wife of Arun Kumar Garg, Tushar Garg son of Arun Kumar</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i></p> <p><i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-4</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i></p>



	60478-2025		<p><i>Garg, Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg and accused Venkat Garg son of Avinash Garg wanted in the case and accused Manish Mittal had to get Rs. 1 crore 75 lakh 50 thousand from Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang on his own responsibility in lieu of getting the plot registered in the name of deceased Harbilas Singh and had taken a guarantee that if the plot was not registered then he would get the money back or would himself pay it, but the plot could not be registered and neither was the money returned. Due to which, accused Manish Mittal, in collusion with the above accused, hatched a conspiracy and through Venkat Garg, fired bullets at Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang with the intention of killing them. Harbilas was killed and Punit Dang was injured.</i></p> <p><i>Also uploaded photographs and sent to Venkat Garg.</i></p>		
--	------------	--	---	--	--



			<u>Evidence collected against the accused</u> <i>(By name in FIR) and also named by the co-accused persons for his conspiracy in the commission of present crime and also mediator in the present deal.</i>		
4.	<i>Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit son of Om Parkash Sharma, resident of Ward No. 14, Sargodha Colony, Naraingarh, District Ambala, Haryana</i> <i>CRM-M-60874-2025</i>	<i>31.01.2025</i> <i>Now in judicial custody</i>	<i>Accused Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit was in collusion with Venkat Garg and used to pretend to help Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang obtain money from him. On January 24, 2025, Vijay Dutt @Google Pandit was in constant phone contact with Venkat Garg, the main accused wanted in the case, and was providing Venkat Garg with the location of Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang via his mobile number. At Venkat Garg's behest, he took Harbilas to the crime scene and, upon arriving, attacked Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang. However, accused Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit was not attacked, and according to</i>	<i>NIL</i> <i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-8</i>	<i>NIL</i>



		<p><i>the statements of the victim, Punit Dang, the attackers had told Vijay Dutt to stay aside during their interrogation. Harbilas was killed and Punit Dang was injured in this attack.</i></p> <p><i>*Accused-petitioner Vijay Dutt @Google Pandit, used to give the locations of presence of Harbilas (since deceased) and Puneet Dang to Venkat Garg which is duly proved in the statements of accused persons & shooters arrested in the present case that the accused-petitioner Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit is their man.</i></p> <p><i>* That in the disclosure statement co-accused Sahil Sharma son of Rajesh Sharma resident of H. No. 51 Jogia Wali Mohalla Ward No. 5 Naraingarh District Ambala has according to the plan, Venkat Garg had asked him to do recce of Chunnu Dang and Harbilas resident Rajju Majra. He</i></p>	
--	--	--	--



			<p><i>had done recce of Chunnu Dang and Harbilas Rajju Majra and as per the plan, he used to give all the information about them to Venkat Garg, Ajay Garg, Arun Kumar, Manish Mittal, Anju Garg and their two sons. Venkat Garg had told him that in this plan, Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit is also with them and</i></p> <p><i>Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit will also bring Harbilas and Chunnu Dang into confidence.</i></p> <p><u>Evidence collected against the accused</u></p> <p><i>*From 24.01.2025 to 26.01.2025, the accused-petitioner made more than 30 calls to co-accused Venkat Garg through WhatsApp calls. (Annexed as Annexure R-12)</i></p>		
5.	<p><i>Sahil Sharma son of Rajesh Kumar Sharma, Resident of 51, Jogiya Wala Mohalla, Naraingarh, Distt. Ambala,</i></p>	<p><i>26.01.2025</i> <i>Now in</i> <i>Judicial</i> <i>Custody</i></p>	<p><i>Accused Sahil Sharma is a friend of main accused Venkat Garg, wanted in the above case, and used to work with accused Venkat Garg in betting in Kala Amb. Accused Sahil Sharma had family</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i> <i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-6</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i></p>



	<p><i>Haryana</i></p> <p><i>CRM-M-61848-2025</i></p>		<p><i>relations with accused Arun Garg, Anju Garg, Tushar Garg, son of Arun Garg, Tushar Garg, son of Avinash Garg, Manish Mittal, son of Gyan Chand, and Anju Garg, wife of Arun Garg, and Sahil Sharma was fully aware of the plot deal. Later, on the instructions of accused Venkat Garg, Sahil Sharma used to do recce of Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang and give complete information to Venkat Garg and along with accused Arun Garg, Anju Garg, Tushar Garg son of Arun Garg, Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg, Manish Mittal son of Gyan Chand, Anju Garg wife of Arun Garg, got involved in the conspiracy to kill Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang and through Venkat Garg, fired bullets at Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang with the intention to kill them. In which Harbilas Singh died and Punit Dang was injured.</i></p> <p><u>Evidence collected against the</u></p>	
--	--	--	--	--



			<u>accused</u> <i>Disclosure statement of accused-petitioner</i>		
6.	<i>Garv @ Garav son of Sanjeev Kumar r/o village Bhil Chappar, PS Bilaspur, Yamuna Nagar, Haryana</i> <i>CRM-M-60417-2025</i>	<i>25.04.2025</i> <i>Now in judicial custody</i>	<i>Accused Garv befriended accused Venkat Garg, wanted in the case, in 2024 at the behest of accused Shubham Sharma. In the third week of December 2024, at the behest of his friend, Venkat Garg, he reached the spot at night in village Rampur Choli, District Yamunanagar, from the location provided by Venkat Garg and found a bag containing four pistols. He made a video of those pistols and sent it to Venkat Garg via Snapchat. On the same night, at the behest of Venkat Garg, he handed over the four pistols along with the bag to two boys sent by Venkat Garg at the bus stand of village Tumbi. The accused, along with his other associates, was involved in the exchange of weapons before and after the incident.</i> <i>Evidence collected</i>	<i>NIL</i> <i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-9</i>	<i>FIR No. 84 dated 21.03.2025 u/s 257, 324(4), 324(5), 308(5), 111(3) BNS & 25-54-59 Arms Act, PS Naraingarh</i>



			<u>against the accused</u> Delivered the weapon of crime.		
7.	<p><i>Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg r/o H.No. 149, Ward No. 7, near Pilkhan wala Kuan, Naraingarh, Ambala</i></p> <p><i>CRM-M-68299-2025</i></p>	<p><i>04.05.2025</i></p> <p><i>Now in judicial custody</i></p>	<p><i>Accused Tushar Garg's mother, Anju Garg, owned a 95-marla plot in Kala Amb, Naraingarh. Arun Garg, along with his family, had negotiated a sale deal with Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang. and had written a deed of sale. However, due to the increase in the price of the plot, Arun Garg and his family became greedy and started refusing to register the plot. Later, co-accused Manish Mittal, along with Venkat Garg, an accused wanted in the case, had allegedly arranged for Venkat Garg to pay Rs. 17.55 million from Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang in exchange for registering the plot in Harbilas Singh's name. However, the plot could not be registered, nor was the money returned. Due to this, co-accused Arun Garg, in collusion with the aforementioned</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i></p> <p><i>The disclosure statement of accused is annexed as Annexure R-10</i></p>	<p><i>NIL</i></p>



			<p><i>accused, conspired and through Venkat Garg, opened fire on Harbilas Singh and Punit Dang with the intention of killing them. Harbilas was killed and Punit Dang was injured.</i></p> <p><u>Evidence collected against the accused</u></p> <p><u>(By name in FIR) and also named by the co-accused persons for his conspiracy in the commission of present crime.</u></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

12. Learned State Counsel contends that the accused Ajay Garg along with all other co-accused, acted in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy and orchestrated the entire attack not only to retain money but also to avenge the attack against Venkat Garg who is a history sheeter and is involved in multiple cases. She further contends that the said Venkat Garg has eloped with the sale consideration paid by the complainants and he escaped to Georgia. Proceedings for his extradition had been initiated by the Government and look out circular has already been issued against him on 25.01.2025.

13. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant contend that the role of the accused can be classified in four different categories. The first category comprises of the persons who actually executed the attack by firing upon deceased and they are namely Gagan,



Shivam, Vicky Malik, Sagar Kashyap (since deceased) and Rajan. The second category being the owners of the property viz. Ajay Garg (non-petitioner) (Anju Garg already on bail) and Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg. The third set of accused persons include Manish Mittal, Venkat Garg, Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit, Arun Kumar Garg and Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg who acted on behalf of the owners and facilitated the execution of the transaction and the fourth category would include the persons who provided the necessary logistics in the form of supplying information and doing recee and supplying the basis logistic support for execution of the offence i.e. Weapons and safe harbor.

(1) CRM-M-32815-2025: Arun Garg Vs. State of Haryana

14 Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Arun Garg contends that in the table mentioned in the status report, there is a wrong description of the role attributed to the petitioner at Sr. No.2 and the correct part has been extracted. The first half of the attribution reflected the attributions against Ajay Kumar Garg i.e. the owner of the property, the subsequent half actually makes reference to the attribution against the petitioner as based upon the disclosure statement of the Sahil Sharma that has been appended by the respondent(s) as Annexure R-7. Counsel contend that the only role attributed to him was that he was a part of the criminal conspiracy, being uncle of Venkat Garg. The name of the petitioner also surfaced in the statement of Puneet Dang @ Chunnu under Section 161. However, when his statement was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. he did not name the petitioner nor attributed any role to him. Even perusal of the



disclosure statement would show that there is no specific allegation of criminal conspiracy.

15 Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only because of the reason that he was pursuing all the cases for and on behalf of Venkat Garg. He submits that the petitioner has no further role. He was never involved in any fraudulent transactions and has been nominated solely on account of him being uncle of Venkat Garg. No role of any nature whatsoever has been attributed to him and he is not shown to have any motive behind the incident or being part of the conspiracy. Even as per the disclosure statement, there is no discovery or recovery of any evidence. The petitioner has been nominated with the aid of Section 120B, IPC without reflecting the mode and manner in which such conspiracy was allegedly entered into and without showing any active or indirect role of the petitioner in orchestrating the offences in hand. Pursuing the statutory remedies or cases before a Court of law on behalf of an accused would not be a sufficient reason to suspect the involvement of the petitioner in commission of the offence as alleged.

16 Learned counsel for the respondent-State as well as counsel for the complainant are not in a position to refer to any role against the petitioner. They, however, vehemently submit that the petitioner is related to Venkat Garg who has absconded after having received a sum of ₹1.75 crores from deceased Harbilas and has refused to get the sale deed executed or to refund the money and it was at the behest of Venkat Garg that the entire incident has been committed.

17 Learned State Counsel contends that the petitioner was involved in criminal conspiracy and he was pursuing all the cases of Venkat Garg.



18 Having heard the counsel for the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the period of custody already undergone by him, the allegations being in the nature of part of a criminal conspiracy which are arguable at this stage and would be determined at the stage of the trial coupled with arguable issues of his involvement, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

(2) CRM-M-50119-2025: Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg Vs. State of Haryana

19 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he was not named in the FIR and his name has cropped up just for being brother of Venkat Garg. The petitioner merely financially supported his brother Venkat Garg, when both his arms and legs were broken and sent some money to him for his medical treatment otherwise he has no connection with him. The petitioner's family has also disowned Venkat Garg in January-2025. He left the country in October, 2024 and from the last two years, the petitioner has no contact with Venkat Garg. There has been no financial gain for the petitioner and that the alleged phone calls are after a period of 04 days of the incident. He submits that even the allegations in the status report are incorrect since accused Venkat Garg had made 15 calls to the petitioner on 29.01.2025 and none of the calls was answered by the petitioner. The only allegation is of recce but there is nothing on record as to how and in what manner the information was shared. Moreover, 05 persons are alleged to be doing only the recce.

20 Learned State Counsel submits that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused as he was involved in doing recce of Harbilas and



Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and he also called Venkat Garg on 29.01.2025, 15 times through Whatsapp Call.

21 A specific query was put to the learned State Counsel as to whether the CDRs have been collected during the course of investigation. Counsel for the State on instructions state that CDRs have been collected, however, it is admitted that only one of the said calls was answered.

22 Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner-Tushar Garg at this point submits that it is incorrect to submit that the calls were made on the day of occurrence, rather, they were made four days after the occurrence as per their own status report.

23 Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the narrative sought to be projected by the respondent is misconceived and proceeds on assumptions unsupported by the material on record. It has been specifically explained by the petitioner in his disclosure that pursuant to the injuries sustained by Venkat Garg in 2024, he was in need of some financial assistance and had asked the petitioner to transfer some money. Undisputedly, Venkat Garg had suffered fracture of his legs and was under treatment in Vardhman Hospital, Mujjafarnagar. The amount had been transferred under those circumstances and there is no material to suggest that the petitioner had ever received any financial benefit from Venkat Garg.

24 It is further contended that the disclosure statement itself reflects that the petitioner is a B.Tech graduate in Computer Science, who had earlier undertaken an internship with a company at Gurugram and remained employed there from 2016 to 2020, whereafter he worked at different places and since August 2024, has been employed at Bengaluru. It is argued that throughout his professional career, the petitioner had no



association with Venkat Garg in relation to the alleged activities or otherwise. It has also been argued that the petitioner has nothing to gain from the incident and that the allegation against him is confined to conducting recce of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. Learned counsel submits that similar allegations of recce have been levelled against four other persons besides Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit, who was allegedly accompanying the deceased at the relevant time and sharing their location. It is, therefore, contended that the investigation agency has failed to point out even a single piece of evidence from which it may be inferred that any information was shared by the petitioner with Venkat Garg, the assailants, or any other co-accused. According to learned counsel, in such circumstances, no rational purpose or objective behind the alleged recce by multiple accused persons is discernible.

25 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, on the other hand, have emphatically referred to the petitioner's alleged association with co-accused Venkat Garg. It is contended that the petitioner had been conducting recce of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu at the behest of Venkat Garg and that financial transactions between them also establish his involvement. It is, however, not disputed that no recovery pursuant to the disclosure statement has been effected either at the instance or at the behest of the petitioner. His clean antecedents are also not disputed.

26 Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that the petitioner-Tushar Garg was involved in doing recce of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and he was giving day to day report to Venkat Garg.



27 Counsel for the injured-Puneet Dang @ Chunnu submits that the petitioner-Tushar Garg was brother of Venkat Garg and there was money transaction between him and Venkat Garg and that is the main reason for making him a part of conspiracy.

28 Responding to the above, Counsel for the petitioner-Tushar Garg contends that the money transaction was of September-2024 and the amount given was for medical treatment of Venkat Garg. Counsel submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR.

29 Having heard counsel for the respective parties, it is evident that arguable issues would arise with respect to the participation of the petitioner as a conspirator. Counsel for the respondent-State as well as counsel for the complainant have not referred to the evidence which would establish the participation of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. It is also not disputed that the calls in fact had been made by Venkat Garg to the petitioner and that the petitioner had not answered the said calls. The specific assertion made by the petitioner about him being B.Tech in Computer Science and thus working at different places and not being in contact with Venkat Garg, have been answered evasively. It is further not disputed that the petitioner was not involved in entering an agreement to sell or any of the settlement or negotiations at any stage and at any point in time. They have also not referred to any evidence on the basis whereof, it may be assumed that any information has been shared by the petitioner about the whereabouts of Harbilas and/or Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. They have also failed to refer to any evidence on the basis whereof, it may be assumed that the petitioner was in receipt of any financial or other benefits from Venkat Garg. They have also failed to reflect, at this stage, about the motive of the



petitioner for assisting Venkat Garg in commission of the offence. The clean antecedents of the petitioner are not disputed. It is also not disputed that he is not named in the FIR and there is no specific attribution to the petitioner.

30 In view of above, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

(3) CRM-M-60478-2025; Manish Mittal Vs. State of Haryana.

31 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Manish Mittal contends that the petitioner has been nominated in the present case with the aid of Section 120-B of the IPC. The date of original agreement to sell was 30.05.2022 and later the target date was fixed as 10.09.2022. Petitioner states that he was involved as a mediator for the first time in October, 2024. He further contends that as per the renewed agreement which was entered 3 days prior to occurrence, Ajay Garg had to refund the amount of Rs.1.20 crores.

32 Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner had no role in the commission of the offence and has been nominated in the present case with the aid of Section 120-B IPC. He was neither the mediator at the time of execution of the agreement to sell nor a signatory to the said agreement. His name cropped up for the first time only when he went to attend a meeting between Ajay Garg as well as deceased Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. It is contended that the petitioner has clean antecedents and had no motive because he was not the beneficiary in the entire transaction of any nature whatsoever, rather the petitioner stood as a guarantor for ensuring that the sale deed is executed and registered and that in the event the needful is not done, he would ensure execution of the agreement. He, thus, contends that post the negotiations, a settlement had



been arrived at between the deceased Harbilas as well as other co-accused wherein renewed terms of settlement were arrived at to which the petitioner is not a party. Hence, he had no knowledge as to whether any amount was to be paid by Venkat Garg or not and that he had in fact been pursuing Venkat Garg to return the amount. He was apprised of the renewed agreement by Puneet Dang @ Chunnu wherein they agreed to execute a sale deed of 50 marlas of land and for return of Rs.1,20,000,00/- in cash.

33 It is contended that although the respondent-State alleges that the petitioner was to receive a share out of Rs.1.75 crores that had been retained by Venkat Garg, however, the documents relied upon by the prosecution show that the petitioner had in fact paid money to Venkat Garg towards the expenses.

34 It has been contended that as per the allegations, the alleged plan to commit murder took place on 24.01.2025 and was executed on 25.01.2025 and that the petitioner was aware whereas the narrative set up by the respondent-State itself contradicts it. Apparently, Venkat Garg had planned about the murder much earlier and that the weapons had been collected in December 2024 and delivered to the shooters. The said acts had already been done in the third week of December 2024, hence, the question of forming any conspiracy with the involvement of the petitioner in January 2025 fails to match the said timelines set by the respondents themselves.

35 It is contended that the liability on the failure to return the money would have fallen upon the petitioner, since he stood as a guarantor. Thus, there was thus no gain for the petitioner in non-execution of the transaction. Besides, Venkat Garg was not introduced by the petitioner and he was already in contact with the victims as well as the co-accused Ajay



Garg and as per the case of the prosecution, said Venkat Garg had specifically conveyed to Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu that sale deed could not be executed without his involvement and consent. It was only thereafter that the petitioner stepped in, to find a way and for smooth transaction, being a respectable person in the locality. The petitioner has not received any financial gain in the transaction and there was no assurance of any such gain as well. The case sought to be built up against the petitioner stands demolished by the evidence collected by the State itself.

36 Counsel for the respondent-State as well as counsel for the complainant contend that the petitioner had stood as a surety and it was on his asking that an additional sum of Rs.1.75 crores had been delivered to Venkat Garg. Said Venkat Garg ran away with the money and the payment has not been returned by the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner was to receive proceeds from the money retained by Venkat Garg. Hence, he became greedy and agreed to stand as a surety for the said payment. The allegation against the petitioner is to the effect that he stood as surety for money that was delivered to Venkat Garg.

37 The prosecution has been confronted that no such allegation has been made in his statement by the complainant that additional amount had been paid on the asking of the petitioner or that the petitioner had in fact introduced Venkat Garg. It is also not disputed that in the Panchayat held on 22.01.2025, when the terms of settlement were renewed and a fresh settlement was arrived at, the petitioner was not present and was not a part of the settlement. It is further not disputed that there is no monetary transaction that would show that the petitioner is a beneficiary in the transaction. He is also not a signatory to the agreement nor at any subsequent stage. No



motive, ill-will or enmity is prima facie referred to by the respondent which can be corroborated from the evidence available on record. Besides, the petitioner has clean antecedents and is in custody since 26.01.2025 and there would be arguable issues with respect to the involvement of the petitioner as a co-conspirator.

38 In view of aforesaid, the present petition deserves to be allowed.

(4) CRM-M-60874-2025; Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit Vs. State of Haryana.

39 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Vijay Dutt @ Google Pandit in contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the statement of Puneet Dang @ Chunnu during investigation. Counsel submits that there are two set of allegations against the petitioner, first that he had conspired with Venkat Garg in order to commit the present offence and second that the petitioner was the one who was sharing the location with Venkat Garg. . It is submitted by the Counsel that petitioner has neither received any money nor had any role in the sale deed. He only convened the Panchayat which took place at the behest of both the parties at petitioner's office. Learned Counsel further states that he was in the car with Harbilas when the assailants attacked him. In support thereof, he refers to the extract of the cross-examination of Puneet Dang

“ It is correct that it was a winter season and was a cold day and windows of the door of the car was closed. It is correct that generally, when windows and doors of the car are closed then the conversation of the occupants of the car cannot be heard by the outsiders as well as the voice or conversation of the outsiders cannot be heard in the car. Volunteered, however the glasses of our car had broken down due to the gunshols and



due to this fact assailants were audible to us. The glasses of driver side window and rear seat of the driver seat were broken in the attack.

40 Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been nominated in the present case only on the statement of Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. He contends that he has been nominated as an accused only on a perception and not for any real participation. The case alleged against the petitioner is that he shared location with the assailants and brought the deceased to the spot where the assailants were waiting for them. The said perception is sought to be corroborated by alleging that the petitioner herein did not sustain any injury. He contends that the petitioner has clean antecedents and has no role of any manner whatsoever despite what is alleged. It is argued by him that the petitioner had been a friend of deceased Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and had been with them in last few minutes and that he had a conversation with Venkat Garg for the first time only on 18.01.2025 in relation to returning the money to Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. It was actually Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu who had come to his house and picked up the petitioner. The injured Puneet Dang @ Chunnu was driving the vehicle and deceased Harbilas was sitting behind him while the petitioner was a co-passenger in the truck and sitting towards the left side. He submits that as per the discussion held, Venkat Garg had agreed to return the money to Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and had asked them to reach at the spot where the payment was to be delivered. It is contended that the locations regarding the places to be reached were, in fact, being shared by Venkat Garg and that it was not the petitioner who was communicating



the said locations to the others. He merely told Puneet Dang @ Chunnu about the location shared. The conversation, if any, that was held at that time when they were travelling together was to the complete knowledge of Harbilas as well as Puneet Dang @ Chunnu and took place only when they did not find any person at the designated location and were given an alternative location to reach. It is submitted that the petitioner had no role of any nature whatsoever either in the agreement to sell or in the negotiations that took place inter se amongst the parties. He had no motive to align with the accused Venkat Garg and that at no point in time prior to January 2025, there had been any contact between the petitioner and Venkat Garg. It is submitted that the only reason why the petitioner could escape unhurt is because the gun fire shots were fired from the right hand side while the petitioner was sitting on left side. Injured Puneet Dang @ Chunnu as well as deceased Harbilas were sitting towards the right side of the vehicle.

41 Similar to Puneet Dang @ Chunnu, the petitioner was able to get out of the vehicle speedily and made good his escape being out of the firing line. The same was only a fortuitous circumstance as it is not the case of the prosecution that the petitioner had connived with the assailants or other accused about orchestrating the attack on deceased. He refers to the disclosure statement of the petitioner wherein it is submitted that conversation with Venkat Garg took place on speaker phone when directions were being given.

42 Counsel for the respondent-State as well as for the complainant, on the other hand, contend that the petitioner was actively in connivance with Venkat Garg as grandmother of Venkat Garg and mother of the petitioner hail from the same village. It is further argued that the petitioner



had been informing minute to minute location through whatsapp and he had brought the deceased to the spot where the assailants were waiting for them. Learned counsel further submit that, as per the disclosure statements, the assailants had met one day prior to the incident and again on the morning of the occurrence. It is also contended that the petitioner had identified Sagar (since deceased), though he allegedly did not know the other assailants.

43 It is further argued that the assailants had specifically asked the petitioner to reach the spot before firing at the other occupants of the vehicle. However, learned counsel for the respondents do not dispute that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and that no recovery has been effected from him at any stage. It is also not disputed that the petitioner was neither a signatory to the agreement to sell nor had he participated in any subsequent negotiations or settlement proceedings.

44 I have heard counsel appearing for the respective parties and have gone through the record.

45 The allegation against the petitioner is that of having shared the location with Venkat Garg. The specific case set up by the petitioner, which remains undisputed is that the location was, in fact, being shared by Venkat Garg himself. It is also evident that Harbilas (since deceased) had himself asked the petitioner to pick up the calls of Venkat Garg. The petitioner was picked by Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu to accompany them for collecting the amount as promised to be delivered by Venkat Garg. Petitioner contends that he had put the calls received from Venkat Garg on a speaker for following the instructions and directions given by Venkat Garg. It is also not disputed that the petitioner was sitting on the left side of the vehicle whereas the shots were fired from the right-hand side.



46 Counsel for the respondents have not been able to refer to any motive for the petitioner which weighed for the petitioner to align with Venkat Garg. The disclosure only establishes the reason behind the link but seemingly does not reflect any connection or association of the petitioner with Venkat Garg as the said disclosure reflects on a greater association with the victims. Besides, the respondents have also not been able to refer, at this juncture, to any reason or motive as to why the petitioner would have designed the elimination of Harbilas. Since the petitioner has offered some kind of explanation which is also corroborated from the testimony of cross-examination of the prosecution witness, the evidence/motive against the petitioner remains an arguable issue to be determined during the course of trial. It is noticed that the only reference of the petitioner is that the negotiation for settlement were once held in the office of the petitioner herein and secondly, at the time of the Panchayat which was held on 22.01.2025, renewing the terms of settlement. It is further admitted by Puneet Dang @ Chunnu that he had a dispute with Venkat Garg and that the accused were having meetings with Venkat Garg. The said matter was later on compromised.

47 It is evident from the above that there is arguable issue with respect to the act of the petitioner as a co-conspirator with the accused Venkat Garg for elimination of Harbilas. Besides, the respondents could not refer to any recovery from the petitioner or refer to any motive against the petitioner herein and that the petitioner has offered some explanation of the conversation and locations exchanged inter se the parties and prior to the incident and the circumstances in which he escaped without receiving any bullet injury as well as the stage of trial and period of custody already



undergone by the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

(5) CRM-M-61848-2025; Sahil Sharma Vs. State of Haryana.

48 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Sahil Sharma in CRM-M-61848-2025 contends that though the petitioner was named in the FIR, however no recovery whatsoever has been effected from him. The only role attributed to him is that he stated that he also conspired with other co-accused. Counsel submits that as per the case of prosecution, petitioner was doing recce on behalf of Venkat Garg of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. However, counsel points out that the allegation of recce, when and how is it connected with the present offence is missing and there is no evidence to show in what manner the petitioner was doing the recce. Counsel further refers to the admission made by Puneet Dang @ Chunnu in his cross-examination wherein he admitted that petitioner had no role in the sale deed. The same reads:-

“Neither Sahil Sharma was alleged party to the agreement to Sell Ex. P3 not he was the beneficiary or witness to the alleged property in question. No amount was given to the accused Sahil Sharma pertaining to the alleged property in question by anyone.

Xxx xxxx xxx

49 Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the only role attributed to petitioner Sahil Sharma is of conspiracy with other co-accused persons and having done recce on behalf Venkat Garg of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu. Counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no evidence as to how and in what manner, the recce was undertaken by the



petitioner and for what purpose. No evidence has been collected to establish any link of the petitioner with Venkat Garg or sharing of any information by him. He further contends that once the claim of the prosecution is specifically to the effect that Google Pandit @ Vijay Dutt had been sharing the entire movement location of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu, there was no further evidence of any recce as alleged. It is further argued that no motive has been established by the prosecution which could have occasioned the petitioner to share any information with them. Reference is also made to the admission of injured witness Puneet Dang @ Chunnu wherein he himself admitted that the petitioner had no role of any nature whatsoever in the sale deed and/or any of the negotiations/settlement that were held between the parties.

50 Learned counsel for the respondent-State as well as for the complainant, on the other hand, have tried to establish the link by between Venkat Garg and the petitioner by stating that they used to study together in College and that he was part of the conspiracy and was doing recce of Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu.

51 Although counsel for respondent-complainant Sudarshan Singh has contended that the petitioner had arranged for the assailants who fired upon Harbilas and Puneet Dang @ Chunnu, however, they are not in a position to refer to any contents of the disclosure or any evidence, on the basis whereof, it may be assumed that the petitioner had played an active role in arranging for the shooters. There is no reference, either in the occurrence in question or in the evidence collected during investigation, to suggest that the petitioner had contacted the assailants or as to what were the terms and conditions settled between the parties for execution of the attack.



It is also not disputed that the petitioner Sahil Sharma has no criminal antecedents and there is no other evidence or recovery having been effected from him.

52 Having heard counsel for the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioner, arguable issues with respect to the petitioner being part of any conspiracy, his clean antecedents and noticing the failure of the respondent-State, at this stage, to refer to any evidence on the basis whereof, the connection of the petitioner with Venkat Garg is established along with lacking of supporting evidence to corroborate the allegation of recce and further noticing the admission by Puneet Dang @ Chunnu in his cross-examination about the petitioner having no role in the execution of the agreement to sell or in the settlement process as well as conspiracy, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

(6) CRM-M-60417-2025: Garav @ Garv Vs. State of Haryana.

53 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Garav @ Garv in CRM-M-60417-2025 contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the disclosure statement made by Shubham. In his disclosure, he stated that Venkat Garg made a snap chat call to Shubham wherein he asked for one boy to collect the bag containing weapons. The allegations against the petitioner is that he picked up the bag from 'A' location and handed over the bag to 'B' location. He further contends that during investigation, nothing came on record which would corroborate how and in what manner petitioner came in contact with Shubham or when these alleged snapchat calls happened between the petitioner-Garav @ Garv and Venkat or Shubham. It is further submitted that there is no recovery effected from the petitioner and the petitioner is a young boy aged 21 years old and



one another FIR has been registered against the petitioner in which he was nominated on the disclosure statement and bail has already been granted by this Court.

54 Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely on the basis of disclosure made by co-accused Shubham. As per the said disclosure, Shubham had allegedly received a call from Venkat Garg directing him to collect a bag containing weapons. He submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that he reached at a spot in village Rampur in District Yamuna Nagar, pursuant to the location shared by Venkat Garg and had found a bag containing pistols. It is alleged that the petitioner made a video of those pistols and forwarded the same to Venkat Garg and that he handed over the aforesaid 04 pistols along with the bag to two boys sent by Venkat Garg at the bus Stand of village Pundri. The role against the petitioner is that of having delivered the weapons. It is contended that even if the entire prosecution version is accepted at its face value, there is nothing on record to suggest that Venkat Garg has ever disclosed the object behind supply of the said weapons. The weapons in question were allegedly supplied after having been picked up from the identified location and thereafter supplied to the assailants. Hence, in the absence of any shared object, intention or knowledge, arguable issues would arise with respect to the petitioner being part of the conspiracy to commit murder.

55 Learned counsel for the respondents however submits that had it been not for the petitioner having supplied weapons to the assailants, the offence in question would never have been committed. It is submitted that the petitioner is involved in another case bearing FIR No.84 dated



21.03.2025 registered under Sections 307, 324 and 323 of the IPC and Section 24 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Naraingarh.

56 Learned State Counsel contends that the petitioner-Garav @ Garv handed over the bag containing four pistols to the two boys sent by Venkat Garg at the bus stand of village Tumbi.

57 Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant contends that the petitioner-Garav @ Garv had sent a video of the pistols through Snapchat to Venkat Garg.

58 I have heard counsel appearing for the respective parties and have gone through the documents.

59 It is evident from the disclosure statement that the petitioner had an active role in the occurrence in question. The material on record prima facie indicates that the petitioner was not only aware of the contents of the bag, namely the weapons, but also had knowledge of the purpose for which the said weapons were being delivered. Besides, the petitioner is stated to have criminal antecedents and is also involved in another case pertaining to organised crime.

60 Taking into consideration the link evidence establishing his contact with the main assailants and the main accused Vankat Garg and his active assistance in smooth execution of the offence coupled with his criminal antecedents, I am of the opinion that he does not deserve any concession of bail at this stage. The present petition is accordingly dismissed.



(7) CRM-M-68299-2025: Tushar Garg Vs. State of Haryana

61 Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg contends that the petitioner has been nominated by the aid of Section 120-B and no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. The only evidence which has been gathered against him as per the status report is his name in the FIR and that he was named by co-accused in their disclosure statement. He further contends that petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely for being the son of the co-accused Ajay Garg and Anju Garg. It is also submitted that perusal of the agreement to sell would reveal that petitioner was neither party to the agreement nor a witness. He was also not present at the spot and he did not arrange for any means for orchestrating the alleged attack. In this case, the entire family of Ajay Garg has been nominated as an accused. In the FIR, same role was ascribed to Nihal Singh and Tushar Garg. Nihal has already been exonerated by the Investigating Agency. Counsel further states that as per prosecution version, a Panchayat was convened on 22.01.2025, in which the petitioner was alleged to be present, however, when Puneet Dang @ Chunnu was confronted with his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., during cross-examination, no such averment was found to have been made against him. He further contends that no recovery had been effected from the petitioner and there is no evidence of the petitioner being part of any conspiracy and now a further case is set up that petitioner transferred a sum of Rs.5 lakhs to Venkat Garg but the same is not a part of the evidence collected against him. There is no detail of the time and mode of payment or even any alleged call details between petitioner and Venkat Garg.



62 Learned State Counsel contends that the petitioner-Tushar Garg son of Ajay Garg gave Rs. 5 lakhs to Venkat Garg for stopping the registry.

63 Counsel for the complainant contends that the petitioner-Tushar Garg is the son of Anju Garg-owner of the property. The petitioner was named in the FIR and his name also appeared in disclosure statement of co-accused and he had also been part of negotiation proceedings for execution of sale deed with deceased Harbilas and injured Puneet Dang @ Chunnu.

64 It is evident from the arguments that the learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that petitioner Tushar Garg has not been attributed any specific role in the entire incident and has been nominated as an accused solely because of being son of owners i.e. Ajay Garg and Anju Garg. He along with his brother Nihal Garg had been nominated, however, during investigation Nihal was found innocent and was thus exonerated by the Investigating Agency. Thus, he contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely on the strength of a disclosure statement and without any evidence. He has no criminal antecedents. It is alleged that the petitioner is stated to have remained present at the time when the subsequent Panchayat was convened on 27.01.2025, in which renewed settlement was arrived at, however, the injured witness Puneet Dang @ Chunnu was confronted with his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. during his cross-examination, wherein he admitted that there was no such allegation of the petitioner being present at any of the stages of the entire dispute inter se the parties i.e. right from entering into the agreement to sell amongst the parties.

65 Leaned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submit that the petitioner had paid a sum of Rs.5 lakhs to Venkat Grag to stop the



registry and that his name appeared in the disclosure statement of the co-accused on account of he being part of the negotiation proceedings.

66 Counsel for the respondent-State as well as for the complainant were asked to refer to the evidence wherefrom any transaction amongst the petitioner Tushar Garg son of Arun Garg with Venkat Garg can be inferred and also to refer to any other evidence on the basis whereof, the involvement of the petitioner in the conspiracy may be inferred at this stage.

67 Learned State counsel is unable to refer to any such evidence at this juncture. The further do not dispute that no recovery has been effected at the instance of the petitioner and that he has clean antecedents. The date of arrest as well as the stage of trial is also not disputed.

68 Therefore taking into consideration that arguable issues would arise with respect to the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the offence. Even if the petitioner was the part of the Panchayat convened on 27.01.2025 to discuss the renewed terms, yet, the same would be an arguable point of his involvement in conspiracy and in murder as well. Currently, the case has been argued against the petitioner solely on the basis of disclosure but no recovery pursuant to said disclosure has been pointed out by the respondents. Noticing the issues as above, the clean antecedents of the petitioner, the stage of the trial as well as the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

(8) CRM-M-8397-2026: Meer Kasim Vs. State of Haryana

69 Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the case against the petitioner as per the allegations set out is that the car in which the assailants escaped after the incident was disposed of by him. It is argued that



the petitioner is thus a link evidence in the chain of events and does not become co-conspirator on the basis of the said evidence. He had no role to play and had no information about the incident that took place and there is no prior malice.

70 Learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant have not referred to any material at this stage on the basis whereof the active participation of the petitioner in the commission of the offence beyond above could be established.

71 Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations that have been levelled against the petitioner and that arguable issue would arise for consideration, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

72 Accordingly, CRM-M-32815-2025: Arun Garg Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-50119-2025: Tushar Garg son of Avinash Garg Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-61848-2025: Sahil Sharma Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-68299-2025: Tushar Garg Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-60874-2025: Vijay Dutt Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-60478-2025: Manish Mittal Vs. State of Haryana; CRM-M-8397-2026; and Meer Kasim Vs. State of Haryana are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

73 It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

74 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case



CRM-M-32815-2025 AND CONNECTED PETITIONS

-47-2026:PHHC:073200

on the basis of available material.

75 CRM-M-60417-2025: Garav @ Garv Vs. State of Haryana, is dismissed.

76 Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

77 A photocopy of the order be placed on the connected file(s).

May 11, 2026.
vishal/raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No