



CRM-M-15577-2026

1

237

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

CRM-M No.15577 of 2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

Deepak @ Tony

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Monika Beriwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.81 dated 26.02.2025, under Sections 109(1), 308(2), 308(4), 111(4) (newly added), 61(2) and 238 of BNS and Sections 25(1B)(c), 27(2) of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sahil Girdhar. It was alleged that on 26.02.2025 at about 8/8:15 PM, he was present at his shop namely, Salamat Sweets and in the meantime, 3-4 boys armed with pistols reached the shop and fired 3-4 gun shots aimed at the complainant. The gun shots hit the glass panes installed in the shop while the complainant managed to save himself. It was alleged that even earlier,

**CRM-M-15577-2026****2**

somebody had demanded ransom from complainant's brother on which a written complaint was filed in the police station on 19.01.2025, pursuant to which FIR No.33 Dated 19.01.2025 was registered. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. The FIR was registered and investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 19.03.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.12.2025. Being aggrieved, earlier petitioner has approached this Court earlier by way of filing CRM-M-42772-2025, however, the same was dismissed as not withdrawn vide order dated 11.11.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He has submitted that the petitioner is not named in the present case and he was nominated later on only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not even an admissible evidence. He submits that neither the petitioner has fired any shot nor any demand of ransom was made by him. He submits that the petitioner has no concern with the co-accused who had allegedly fired shot with the country made pistols or threatened the complainant. To buttress his



CRM-M-15577-2026

3

arguments, he submits that co-accused Jagbir Singh has already been granted bail by learned trial Court vide order dated 01.12.2025 and the case of the petitioner is on parity with that of co-accused who has been granted bail. He further submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest and nothing is to be recovered from the him and thus, in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender who is involved in 03 more cases. He submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner that he had entered into a conspiracy with the co-accused for the purpose of demand of ransom from the complainant and in pursuance of such conspiracy, the co-accused had tried to kill the complainant by firing gun shots upon him while he was present at his shop. He submits that the petitioner had supplied four country made pistols and 25 to 30 cartridges to co-accused Anoop @ Faizal. He submits that one of the motorcycle used in the commission of offence, was also recovered from the petitioner. He submits that the role of the petitioner is far more different than that of co-accused Jagbir Singh, who has already been granted bail by learned trial Court vide order dated 01.12.2025. He submits that earlier also the petitioner had approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-42772-2025, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 11.11.2025. He thus, submits that no case for



CRM-M-15577-2026

4

the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in 03 more cases. There are serious allegations against the petitioner who along with co-accused, was part of a well planned conspiracy. Petitioner allegedly supplied 04 country made pistol and 25 to 30 cartridges to one Anoop @ Faizal after arranging the same from one Sardar resident of Bhuranpur, Madhya Pradesh. The role of the petitioner is different than that of the co-accused Jagbir, who has been granted regular bail by the trial Court.

6. Perusal of the record would show that earlier also the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-42772-2025, however, when this Court was not inclined to grant the said relief to him, the same was dismissed as withdrawn on 11.11.2025.

7. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail, at this stage. Petition stands dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.05.2026
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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