



107+214/2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 02.07.2026.

(i) CRM-M-3240-2026 (O&M)

Amit @ Ammu

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(ii) CRM-M-18704-2026 (O&M)

Harkesh alias Himanshu

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-3240-2026.

Mr. Sudhir Rana, Advocate with
Mr. Hitesh Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Ankush Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-18704-2026.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

CRM-25587-2026 in CRM-M-3240-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

**Main cases.**

1. This order shall dispose of above-said two petitions i.e. CRM-M-3240-2026 titled as “Amit @ Ammu Vs. State of Haryana” and CRM-M-18704-2026 titled as “Harkesh @ Himanshu Vs. State of Haryana”, whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No. 216 dated 06.07.2024 under Sections 103(1) of BNS (Section 3(5) of BNS deleted later on and Section 61(2) of BNS added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kasola, District Rewari (Annexure P-1).
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Amit @ Ammu, petitioner in CRM-M-3240-2026 submits that the petitioner was not initially named as one of the assailants in the FIR (Annexure P-1). Rather, during the course of investigation, the disclosure statement of Harender was recorded by the police and the petitioner was wrongly arrested in the present case on 08.09.2025. He further submits that apart from the above referred evidence, no other incriminating material was collected by the police, which could even remotely suggests the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. He further submits that even as per the admitted case of the prosecution, Shiv Kumar @ S.P. was carrying an illicit weapon and had fired on the deceased all of a sudden, during the course of altercation. He further referred to the orders (Annexures P-8 to P-10) passed by this Court, whereby concession of bail has been granted to co-accused, namely, Bhanu Pratap alias Khottu, Devender alias Debu and Sachin and submits that on parity also, the petitioner is entitled to be released on bail.
3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Harkesh @ Himanshu, petitioner in CRM-M-18704-2026 also raised the similar



arguments and submitted that no overt act has been attributed to the petitioner and at the worst, he was shown to be present at the place of occurrence. However, the petitioner was wrongly arrested on 08.09.2025, without any evidence against him. Moreover, the petitioner is a student and his case deserves to be sympathetic consideration by this Court.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been leveled against the present petitioners and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. It is not in dispute that three similarly placed co-accused, namely, Bhanu Pratap alias Khottu, Devender alias Debu and Sachin have been ordered to be released on bail. The petitioners are in custody since last about 10 months and there is no specific attribution to anyone of them.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
hemlata

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