

229

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

CRM-M-48907-2025

Date of decision : 08.09.2025

Karamjeet @ Bobby

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ


Present: Mr. Edward Augustine George, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana and
Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.152 dated 01.05.2024 under Sections 120-B, 201, 202, 302, 34, 387, 411 & 471 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Karnal.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Rakesh Kumar. It was alleged that his son Sumit (deceased) was running an office in the name of Balaji International Courier at Mughal Canal, Karnal. His son told the complainant that he was threatened on phone by Daler Kotia gang to pay a ransom of Rs.1 crore. On 30.04.2024 at about 05:00 P.M., his son left for home after completing his work in the office. When his son reached in front of Rana Academy, Sector 14 on his motorcycle, two unknown boys riding on a motorcycle tried to kill him by firing bullets on him. One



bullet hit on his right arm and two bullets on his stomach. His son was shifted to PGIMER, Chandigarh. Son of the complainant was not capable of giving the statement. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. The injured Sumit succumbed to the injuries on 17.05.2024 and thus, the FIR which was initially registered for the offence under Section 307 IPC, was turned into Section 302 IPC. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Co-accused i.e. the shooters were found to be Gaurav Bainsla and Sumit @ Sunny and they were arrested. On their disclosure statements, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused and resultantly, he was arrested on 31.05.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Karnal praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.08.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. He has submitted that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had carried out the recce. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order passed by this Court in **CRM-M-42525-2025** dated 11.08.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lakshay Kadyan, has been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who has



already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer of the petitioner and submits that complicity of the petitioner has been duly proved during the investigation. He endorsed the fact that the case of petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Lakshay Kadyan, who has already been granted bail by this Court. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is noticed that name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case only on the basis of a disclosure statement of the co-accused. As per the case of the prosecution, the allegation against the petitioner is that it was the petitioner who carried out the recce. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lakshay Kadyan, has already been granted bail by the Court vide order dated 11.08.2025 passed in **CRM-M-42525-2025**.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with the co-accused as stated above. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be



treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

08.09.2025

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No