



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

234

CRM-M-6372-2025

Date of decision: 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2025

Vikas @ Vicky

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Devinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 189 dated 13.06.2020 registered under Sections 302, 307, 120-B and 34 of IPC and Sections 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station I.M.T. Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. As per the allegations, on 13.06.2020, the complainant Yoganand along with his brother Satpal and his wife was going towards Delhi in their car. While on the way, they stopped near Bhalot bus stand and Satpal had alighted to take some articles, whereas, his wife and complainant were in the vehicle. In the meanwhile, the petitioner accompanied by the accused Naveen reached there in a motor bike. They fired a bullet at Satpal thereby hitting his chest. He had fallen down and starting bleeding profusely.



The assailants fled within the sight of the complainant. The injured was rushed to hospital but succumbed to the firearm injury sustained by him. On his statement, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Post mortem examination of the dead body was conducted. On the same day, the petitioner was found in an injured condition by the police. One country made pistol and two live cartridges were recovered from him. He was admitted in hospital. The vehicle used at the time of incident was found to be belonging to accused Manbeer @ Manne. He was arrested on 14.06.2020. The co-accused Amit was also arrested on suspicion. Both of them suffered disclosure statement admitting their involvement in the crime and by disclosing that by hatching a conspiracy with the petitioner and the co-accused, the murder of the victim was committed. Offence under Section 120-B of IPC was added. The co-accused Pawan, Mohit, Vikas and Neeraj were subsequently arrested. The petitioner was formally arrested on 16.04.2020 on his discharge from the hospital. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement and identified the place of occurrence. Investigation has since been concluded and the petitioner is facing trial along with the co-accused.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There was no opportunity for PW-2 Jyoti to see the assailants, when the victim Pardeep was allegedly shot at. Infact, there was no eye witness to the incident and false witnesses have been planted later on. There are material contradictions in the statements of the complainant and eye witnesses, as recorded before the police. The FSL report shows that the recovered cartridge was not found to be fired from the



pistol allegedly recovered from the petitioner. Trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude as most of the witnesses remain to be examined. His further incarceration would be of no useful purpose. He has been acquitted in two of the cases, as registered against him. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He was not only specifically named in the FIR but was also identified by PW-2 Jyoti wife of the victim and PW-3 Yoganand, Complainant, both of whom were very much present at the spot. They have fully supported the prosecution version. Pistol recovered at the instance of petitioner, was found to be in working condition and some bullets were also found from the clothing of the victim. As per the FSL report, no definite opinion could be formed regarding the weapon recovered from the petitioner being used but from this no inference can be drawn in favour of the petitioner. Trial is going at a good pace and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. The petitioner is a habitual offender. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. Rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

6. The petitioner by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused is



alleged to have murdered the victim by using firearm. He was specifically named in the FIR. The eye-witnesses are shown to have supported the prosecution version. He is involved in some other cases and has criminal antecedents. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of the sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court is of the opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**15<sup>th</sup> May, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

|                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable         | : | Yes / No |