



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

CRM-M No.12789 of 2026

Date of decision: 06.04.2025

RAMNIWAS ALIAS KALLU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Vikram Satpal Anand
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J.

1. The present is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.343 dated 15.07.2025, registered under Sections 109(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 307 and 34 IPC, 1860) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gurugram.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 14.07.2025 at about 05:50 PM, the complainant Rahul was going towards SPR Road via Baharampur Road from his village Fazilpur in his Thar vehicle bearing registration No. HR-98-0008. It is alleged that his vehicle was overtaken by a Tata Punch car bearing registration number of HR-10 series, which intercepted his vehicle, whereupon two persons alighted from



the said car, one of them being armed with a pistol. The complainant reversed his vehicle, whereafter the armed person fired a shot at him, which missed and hit a pole, and the complainant managed to escape. The assailants fled from the spot and it was noticed that 3–4 persons were present in the said car. On the basis of the said complaint, the present FIR was registered and investigation was set into motion. During investigation, the vehicle used in the commission of the offence was taken into possession and several accused persons were arrested at different stages, whose disclosure statements were recorded. Mobile phones and other material were also taken into possession and CCTV footage of the place of occurrence was collected. After completion of investigation against some of the accused, final report was presented before the Court and thereafter other accused persons were also arrested subsequently in connection with the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is not named in the FIR. It is submitted that his implication is solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Vishal Chauhan, who has given contradictory versions in his statements, and such disclosure statement has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law. It is further contended that the allegations against the petitioner are vague and there is no independent or corroborative evidence connecting him with the alleged occurrence. It is also submitted that at the time of the alleged incident, the petitioner was already in judicial custody in another case and, therefore, his involvement



in the present occurrence is highly doubtful. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been formally arrested in the present case through production warrants and has been in custody since 08.10.2025. It is contended that the investigation stands completed and final report has already been filed, and the case is now pending trial, which is likely to take considerable time as a large number of prosecution witnesses are cited. It is further submitted that similarly situated co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. The petitioner undertakes to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed by the Court and assures that he will not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence the witnesses.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are grave, serious and specific in nature. It is contended that the petitioner has played an active, direct and pivotal role in the commission of the offence. As per the investigation, the petitioner, while being lodged in jail, had hatched a criminal conspiracy along with co-accused to eliminate the complainant. In furtherance of the said conspiracy, he remained in touch with his accomplices through jail phone and had specifically contacted co-accused Deepak Nandal and others and issued instructions for execution of the crime. It is further submitted that the petitioner had deputed his son Hitesh to conduct recce of the complainant's house, vehicle and movements and to provide vital information to the shooters. Acting upon the instructions of the petitioner,



an attempt was made on the life of the complainant by firing upon him. It is also contended that the petitioner facilitated the commission of the offence by aiding in planning and execution and thus, cannot claim parity with co-accused who have been granted bail, as his role is distinct and more serious.

5. Learned State counsel has further argued that as many as 14 other criminal cases of similar nature are pending against the petitioner, which reflects his criminal antecedents and propensity to indulge in such offences. It is submitted that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and in case the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood that he may influence, threaten or intimidate the witnesses, particularly the complainant, thereby adversely affecting the trial. It is also contended that there is a reasonable apprehension that the petitioner may again indulge in similar offences if released on bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

7. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, and the fact that he is alleged to have hatched the conspiracy from within the jail and remained in constant touch with his accomplices for execution of the crime, this Court finds that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of regular bail at this stage. The involvement of the petitioner in as many as 14 other criminal cases of similar nature further weighs against him. Although the case is based on circumstantial evidence, the material witnesses are yet to be examined and



not even a single prosecution witness has been examined so far. In such circumstances, there is a reasonable apprehension that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence the witnesses.

8. In view of the afore-said facts and circumstances, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

06.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>