



CRM-M-7565-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-7565-2026

Decided on :07.04.2026

Munesh Lamba

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in case FIR No.34 dated 22.01.2025, under Sections 111(3), 111(4), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 238 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25(6) of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Palwal, District Palwal, Haryana.

2. As per the prosecution, petitioner is named in the FIR and is alleged to have acted as an active associate and a sleeper cell member of the Neeraj Faridpuriya Gang. On instructions of the gang leader, Neeraj Faridpuriya, petitioner is alleged to have arranged accommodation and logistics for gang members and shooters, conducted reconnaissance of targeted persons or places for extortion, and assisted in the transportation and concealment of weapons and ammunition.

It is further alleged that petitioner received 10 rounds of pistol ammunition from a gang member at Tappal (U.P.), temporarily handed over 5 rounds to Kuldeep Tyagi, later retrieved them, and during the investigation, 5 live cartridges were recovered from the petitioner, while the remaining 5 live cartridges were forwarded by him to another gang member, namely Kaju @ Dhan Singh. Additionally, the petitioner is

**CRM-M-7565-2026****2**

alleged to have provided shelter to an absconding gang member and maintained secret communication with the gang leader through mobile phones and encrypted applications arranged by the gang.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2025. Counsel further submits that co-accused, namely Vishal Kaushik, has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.11.2025 (P-4), and another co-accused, namely Amit, has also been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Palwal, vide order dated 24.11.2025 (P-5).

Counsel submits that co-accused in similar circumstances have already been released on regular bail, learned Counsel prays that the petitioner may also be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel submits that the petitioner is not only named in the present FIR but is also involved in other criminal cases. Counsel further submits that petitioner's alleged role in the gang activities is serious, involving logistics, sheltering absconding members, and handling ammunition. Thus, prays for dismissal of present petition.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioner is known to the police officials only because of his involvement in other pending cases, and on that basis, he has been wrongly implicated in the present matter.

**CRM-M-7565-2026****3**

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book alongwith the appended documents.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2025, and that co-accused, namely Vishal Kaushik and Amit, have already been granted regular bail by this Court and the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Palwal respectively, this Court is of the view that no substantial purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petition is 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

07.04.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*