



CRM-M-61776-2025

1

221

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

CRM-M-61776-2025

Date of Decision: 11.11.2025

AKASH MISHRA

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Sukhbir Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.84, dated 21.03.2025, registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala, under Sections 287, 324(4), 324(5), 308(5), 111(3), 111(5) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and 25(6)/29 of Arms Act 1959.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that one Lalit Dhiman got recorded his statement to the police with the allegations that he owns one Hyundai Creta Car bearing registration No.HR-04-J-7777. On 20.03.2025 at about 10:00 P.M, he came to his house and parked his car in front of his house. At about 11:00 P.M, he went to sleep and on 21.03.2025 at about 1.30 A.M, he heard the sound of crackers. On



31.03.2025, at about 7:00 P.M, he came out from his house and saw that 2-3 persons had fired gun shots on the dickie of his car and he sought action against them. During investigation, one Mohd. Shameem was arrested and he suffered disclosure statement and nominated Viren Partap @ Nonnu who was arrested on 28.03.2025. On 03.04.2025, Viren Partap suffered fresh disclosure statement admitting his role in the present crime. Allegation against the present petitioner is that he accompanied co-accused Mohd. Shameem and Suraj for firing at car of complainant. On 10.04.2025, Deepak Sharma alias Gagi and Sohan Lal Sharma alias Sonu were arrested and the offences under Section 111(3) and 111(5) of BNS, 2023 were added and they also suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the present crime and that accused Deepak Sharma alias Gagi, Vanket Garg and Surya Partap Singh had brought country made pistol and 16 bullets from Punjab and gave the pistol to one Shubham Sharma. Said Shubham Sharma was arrested on 14.04.2025 and Shaukeen was also arrested on the same day. They also suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the present crime. On 15.04.2025, Deepak Sharma got recovered Splendor Plus motorcycle used in committing the crime. On 16.04.2025, Surya Pratap Singh was arrested and he also suffered a disclosure statement admitting having concealed one country made pistol which was used in committing the crime. On 17.04.2025, Shubham Sharma was again interrogated and he suffered a fresh disclosure statement nominating his father Sohan Lal Sharma as an accused and Sohan Lal Sharma was rejoined in the investigation based on this fresh disclosure statement and his police remand was obtained. He disclosed that he had given Rs.10,000/- to his



son Shubham Sharma to stay somewhere else and has concealed the country made pistol in his dera at Village Marwakalan and thereafter, he got recovered the country made pistol used in committing the crime which was taken into possession. Thereafter, co-accused Garv was arrested who disclosed that in March, 2025 his friend Lavish and Shubham Sharma had brought two pistols from his father Sohan Lal Sharma and he gave both the pistols to Manjeet alias Padi at the behest of Shubham Sharma and thereafter, accused Shaukeen had got transferred Rs.15,000/- and Rs.9,500/- to accused Garv from his Punjab National Bank account and at the behest of accused Shaukeen on 23.03.2025, accused got deposited Rs.10,000/- in his same account and another sum of Rs.20,000/- again on 26.03.2025. Thereafter, accused Manjeet alias Padi got recovered two cartridges. It has also been informed during investigation that on 01.05.2025, Sohan Singh was arrested and he also suffered a disclosure statement and he had deposited a sum of Rs.79,000/- in the accounts of arrested accused Shaukeen and Garv. Present petitioner was nominated on the disclosure statement of co-accused Suraj Singh and Taranjeet Singh. Allegation against the present petitioner is that he harboured co-accused Suraj Singh and Taranjeet Singh and also gave them Rs.2 lakh. After completion of investigation, final report has been presented against all the accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner- Akash Mishra argued that he is in custody since 24.04.2025 and the allegation against the present




petitioner are that he harboured co-accused Suraj and Taranjeet Singh who had stayed in the house of present petitioner on 14/15.04.2024 for one day after 24 days of the occurrence and he had supplied amount of Rs.2 lakh to them. The challan has already been presented. The trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude. Co-accused Viren Partap Singh, Deepak Sharma alias Gagi Pandit, Garav alias Garv, Surya Partap Singh, Mohd. Shameem have already been released on bail by this Court. Learned counsel, thus, prayed that the petitioner be released on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Petitioner- Akash Mishra is in custody since 24.04.2025. No one has been named in the FIR and petitioner has been nominated merely on the basis of disclosure statements suffered by co-accused. As to how much evidentiary value will be attached to their disclosure statements shall be the subject matter of trial. Investigation has already been completed and challan has been presented and trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude. Co-accused namely Viren Partap Singh, Deepak Sharma alias Gagi Pandit, Garav alias Garv, Surya Partap Singh and Mohd. Shameem have already been released on bail by this Court whose cases are identical to that of petitioners. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he deserve 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 bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

11.11.2025
Ali

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