



CRM-M-71008-2025 (O&M)

1

216

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

**CRM-M-71008-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 22.12.2025**

Abhishek @ Sharry

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner- Abhishek @ Sharry aged 34 years has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 150, dated 06.04.2024, registered under Sections 365, 34 IPC (Section 364A, 452, 386, 148, 149, 120-B IPC added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula.

2. Incident took place on 06.04.2024, at about 9:30 PM, when the complainant – Rishi Pal was taking meal at his home. As per the allegations, 7/8 boys entered the house and by showing pistol-like weapons, sticks and rods, kidnapped him from there and forcibly put him inside a Mahindra XUV-500 car bearing registration No. HR26-CD-1731 of silver colour. At the time of occurrence, Manjit Kaur and Ashok Kumar were also sitting there. It is further alleged that the accused had reached the house of the complainant in three vehicles — the aforesaid XUV-500, a Swift (black colour) and a Verna (white colour).

After kidnapping the complainant, they proceeded towards Panchkula-Zirakpur



Highway. Thereafter, the complainant was taken to some deserted place, where the accused persons started demanding money from him. It is also mentioned in the FIR that while the complainant was being kidnapped, the accused persons were calling each other by their names and therefore the complainant came to know of two names, namely, Anmol and Ankit. Subsequently, Manjit Kaur was called upon by the accused persons and ransom amount of ₹ 25,00,000/- was demanded from her, if she wanted to see the complainant alive. Later on, after about 2½ hours, the complainant was dropped near Sector-21, Tau Devi Lal Stadium, Panchkula, after receipt of the ransom amount.

3. While making submissions on behalf of the petitioner – Abhishek @ Sharry, learned counsel argues that petitioner is not named in the FIR and like his co-accused Arun Baniwal @ Arun @ Jangira, petitioner is also implicated in the present case solely on the basis of one alleged phone call made by him to co-accused Gagandeep Mann, who was not even named in the FIR and whose name surfaced only through disclosure statements of some other accused. Apart this, no other criminal case was ever registered against the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature, involving offences under Sections 364-A & 386 of IPC (added later), which carry severe punishment. He further submits that the complainant was forcibly kidnapped at gunpoint, taken away in multiple vehicles, assaulted, and ransom of ₹ 25,00,000/- was extorted before he was released. The nature of the act shows pre-planning and organized execution, involving a group of armed persons.

Learned State counsel further submits that trial is underway, and given the seriousness of the allegations, no ground is made out for grant of regular



bail. However, learned State counsel fairly conceded the other factual submissions, so addressed by the petitioner's counsel here-above.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the record with their able assistance.

6. From the record, it is not in dispute that the petitioner is in custody since 18.06.2024 i.e., for more than 01 year and 07 months. Out of 28 prosecution witnesses, only two material witnesses including the complainant have been examined so far, and the pace of trial is admittedly slow. Two witnesses have already been given up.

7. This Court is conscious of the gravity of the allegations under Sections 364-A and 386 of IPC. However, prolonged pre-trial incarceration, especially when the trial is likely to take considerable time, cannot be overlooked. The petitioner has already undergone substantial custody; there is no allegation that he has attempted to tamper with evidence or threaten any witness after arrest; and the key prosecution witnesses, including the complainant, have already been examined. Thus, considering the totality of circumstances, custodial period, the progress of trial, absence of recovery from the petitioner, and the fact that his further detention will not serve any useful purpose, this Court is satisfied that a case for grant of regular bail is made out.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.



CRM-M-71008-2025 (O&M)

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.
10. Petition stands disposed of.
11. Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

December 22, 2025
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO