



211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15559-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

PUNIT SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Ms. Sakshi Khera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.K. Ambavta, DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

CRM-11736-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-15559-2025

1. This is first 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. Reply by way of affidavit dated 18.08.2025 of Manoj Verma, H.P.S., Deputy Superintendent of Police, Palwal, District Palwal filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. 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 14.07.2025 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 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. Petitioner-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.

4. 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.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Its a blind murder and no one had seen the occurrence taking place. Name of petitioner has cropped up



in the disclosure statement of co-accused Sumit and others who were initially arrested. Petitioner was never named in the FIR and he has been arrested after he was nominated as an accused on the disclosure statement of co-accused. There is no evidence against him except his own disclosure statement and the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused which are not admissible in evidence as no recovery has been effected in pursuance of his disclosure statement. The weapon of offence too has not been recovered. The petitioner is in custody since 29.01.2024. The trial is certainly going to take sufficiently long time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he deserves to be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from S.I. Harvinder Singh, argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and he is the main conspirator and had also participated in the crime and had fired gunshot at the victim. Petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in two more cases of murder, one case of attempt to murder besides three more cases under Section 384 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 120B and 506 of IPC whose details have been given in para No.17 of the status report furnished by the police and in view of his past conduct, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. The offence in question has been committed by unknown persons and no one had seen the occurrence taking place. One of the accused namely Sumit was arrested on the basis of secret information and he disclosed the name of some more accused persons namely Manoj, Nishant, Anuj and one juvenile who were also arrested. Name of



petitioner was also disclosed by co-accused and he was arrested on 29.01.2024. The only evidence against the petitioner, at this stage, is his own disclosure statement as well as disclosure statements of co-accused according to which he had fired gunshot at the victim to take revenge of his insult by the deceased. However, how much evidentiary value will be attached to the said disclosure statements will be seen during the trial. The petitioner is in custody since 29.01.2024. The trial is likely to take some more time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he deserves to be released on bail. It is pertinent to mention that petitioner is already on bail in two cases of murder registered against him whose copies of orders have been produced today in Court by learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. 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

19.08.2025
Ali

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