



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M-21293-2025
Decided on : 08.12.2025

Mayank

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Mandeep S. Kundu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 151 dated 28.06.2024, under Sections 201, 302/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Rai, District Sonipat.

2. Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of an affidavit of Vipin Ahlawat, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rai Sonipat, in Court today. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

2. In regard to the question to be answered by the State on 14.10.2025, the following order was passed

“1. Petitioner – Mayank, has filed the present petition has been filed u/s 483 of BNSS, 2023, for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.151, dated 28.06.2024, u/s 201, 302/34 of IPC, 1860, registered at P.S. Rai, District Sonipat.

2. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 13.10.2025 in Court, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the opposite counsel.

3. As per the status report, the petitioner had handed over a .32 bore pistol to his co-accused, ‘Sagar’, who thereafter fired shot at the deceased, ‘Suresh’. For explaining the connectivity, it has been alleged by the prosecution that the petitioner – Mayank, intended to



claim the insurance policy worth ₹50.00 lakhs. However, there is no explanation as to why the co-accused, 'Sagar', took interest in murdering a person who, as per record, was not previously alleged to be involved in any other similar activity. Whether any investigation has been carried out to establish the presence of the co-accused at the site of the murder is also not explained in the status report. Even the mobile locations of the co-accused 'Sagar' and the present petitioner have not been explained therein.

4. *Let a fresh and comprehensive status report be filed, keeping in mind the aforesaid observations made here-above.*

5. *List again on 08.12.2025."*

3. Reading out the status report, learned State counsel submits that, as per the disclosure statement dated 16.07.2024 of petitioner-Mayank, he had taken an insurance policy of ₹50 lakhs in the name of Suresh, his maternal uncle, and the sister of the deceased, who happens to be the mother of the petitioner, was mentioned as the nominee of the said policy.

4. Without arguing much on the merits, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition

5. Dismissed as withdrawn as prayed for.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

08.12. 2025

rashmi

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