



CRM-M-46222-2025(O&M)

-1-

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

106+221

CRM-M-46222-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.09.2025

Kailash Chander

... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA.

Present: Mr. Ankit Karna, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)**CRM-34602-2025**

Allowed as prayed for.

Documents (Annexure P-5 and P-6) along with bills of crop sale filed on behalf of the petitioner are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, registered under Sections 285, 307, 384, 506 & 34 IPC (Sections 109, 111, 386, 387, 412, 507 & 120-B of IPC added later on) and Section 25 of the Arms Act (Section 27 of the Arms Act added later on) at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonipat.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case are that on 21.01.2024, an information regarding firing at Matu Ram Chowk was received. Upon receiving the information, SI Hariom along with HC Manoj reached at the spot. SI Hariom



clicked photographs of the place of occurrence. FSL team was called. Complainant Neeraj Gupta s/o Rajender Gupta r/o Hukamchand Mandi, Gohana, moved a complaint that he is running a sweets shop in the name of “Lala Maturam Rajender Parshad” at Shiv Chowk, Old Grain Market. On 21.01.2024 at about 10.30 AM, he along with staff was working at his shop. His brother Raman was also present at the shop. In the meantime, three young boys came on Motor Cycle from the side of old grain market Gohana and fired around 30-40 shots towards the shop with intention to kill. Bijender, who used to deliver milk at his shop, got injured due to gun shot. The accused also left a slip demanding Rs.2.00 crores otherwise to kill the owner of shop. On the said complaint, the present FIR has been registered. The accused (petitioner herein) was arrested on the ground that his son namely Sahil along with Himanshu @ Bhau is running gang from abroad which extends threat by using signal or telegram app and the petitioner provides logistic support to the member of the gang and collects the amount of ransom.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner belongs to a respectable family and he has clean and clear antecedents and has disowned his son namely Sahil and has no connection with him who has settled himself abroad. He was nominated in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused namely Sunil @ Gollu, who has already been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-61473-2024 (Sunil @ Gollu Vs. State of Haryana). The case of the present petitioner is on better footing. Regarding deposit of money by petitioner in his joint account with his wife, learned counsel has placed on record the sale deed executed by his wife namely Smt. Anita Devi in the month of July 2023. He further contends that no prosecution witness has raised any finger



towards him that he ever demanded any extortion money and given any threat.

The present petitioner is in custody for the last 1½ year.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition by submitting that the petitioner is involved in an extortion racket. The documents placed on record regarding the sale of land are not in the notice of the prosecution and he has prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. The co-accused namely Sunil @ Gollu, has already been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-61473-2024 (Sunil @ Gollu Vs. State of Haryana) and the petitioner is nominated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Sunil @ Gollu. Regarding deposit of money in his account, it is a moot question and to be adjudicated during trial by the trial Court after receiving evidence on behalf of both parties. It is not disputed by learned State counsel that there is no evidence on record that the petitioner has extended any threat or made a call regarding the extortion.

7. So taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances of the case and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal activities; no FIR is pending against him except the present instance; the petitioner is in custody for the last 1½ year; petitioner and co-accused have already been granted bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, registered under Sections 307 and 34 IPC (Sections 120-B, 109, 111 of IPC added later on) and Section 25 of the Arms Act (Section 29 of Arms Act added later on) at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat, vide order dated 12.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-61473-2024 (Sunil @ Gollu Vs. State of Haryana),

**CRM-M-46222-2025(O&M)****-4-**

which is registered regarding the same incident and the trial will take time to conclude, this Court deems it a fit case to grant him concession of regular bail.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. 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 on the basis of available material.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also be disposed of.

02.09.2025

monika verma

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No