



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

CRM-M-16029-2025

Date of Decision: 29.09.2025

SUMIT KANOJIYA

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Ms. Sakshi Khera, Advocate
for the petitioner (Through V.C).

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana assisted by
S.I. Harvinder Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is second petition for regular bail in case FIR No.498, dated 15.07.2023, registered at Police Station City Palwal, District Palwal (Haryana), under Sections 148, 149, 302, 34 and 120B of IPC, 1860 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 14.07.2023 at about 11:00 PM, a telephonic information was received in police control room that one unknown person has been shot dead at Alaapur road Patli Khurd on the basis of which SI Krishan Chand alongwith other police officials reached at the spot where dead body was lying with gunshot injuries. From the Aadhar card and Pan card lying in the pocket of the



deceased, the name of deceased came to be known as Sachin. On 15.07.2023, Khem Chand, father of the deceased moved complaint to the effect that on 14.07.2023 at about 5:30 PM, his son Sachin had left on his motorcycle from home and thereafter, he received information about his murder and he alleged that some unknown persons have committed his murder. During investigation, it was revealed by some secret informer that murder has been committed by Sumit (petitioner) who was joined in the investigation. On interrogation, he disclosed that Manoj, Nishant, Anuj and one more person who was a juvenile were involved in the incident in question and they were also arrested. Accused-Punit Sharma was arrested on 29.01.2024 and his disclosure statement was recorded wherein he disclosed that he alongwith his co-accused had assembled at his house and told his friends that deceased Sachin had insulted and humiliated him and had beaten him badly and he wants to take revenge and that he had fired a gunshot at the deceased and weapon was handed over to Neeraj co-accused. After completion of investigation, challan was presented for trial.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned State counsel and have gone through the material collected by the police during investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is a blind murder case and no one had seen the occurrence taking place. The deceased was not seen in the company of petitioner or any other person prior to the incident and the present case was based on circumstantial evidence. The only evidence against the petitioner is his own disclosure evidence and he was arrested



on the basis of secret information that he has committed the offence. The disclosure statement suffered by the petitioner is not admissible in evidence. Even as per the disclosure suffered by the co-accused Puneet Sharma, it is he who had fired the gunshot but no such weapon of offence has also been recovered. Petitioner is in custody since 26.07.2023. The trial is going to take a long time to conclude. Co-accused Puneet Sharma has been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 19.08.2025 and case of petitioner is identical to that of co-accused and he too is, thus, entitled to be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from S.I. Harvinder Singh, argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. The offence in question has been committed by unknown persons and no one had seen the occurrence taking place. After the occurrence in question, petitioner was arrested on the basis of secret information that he had committed the offence in question and thereafter, he suffered a disclosure statement admitting having committed the offence in question. However, how much evidentiary value will be attached to the said disclosure statements shall be subject matter of trial. Petitioner is in custody since 26.07.2023. The trial is certainly going to take sufficiently long time to conclude. Co-accused Puneet Sharma has been released on bail by this Court vide order dated 19.08.2025 and case of petitioner is identical to that of co-accused and he too is, thus, entitled to be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is

allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

29.09.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No