



CRM-M-20163-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

CRM-M-20163-2024
Decided on :21.01.2026

Pankaj @ Panku

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present 2nd petition, has filed instant petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 11 dated 06.01.2022, registered under Sections 302, 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (however, challaned under Sections 201, 302, 34 and 120-B IPC alongwith Section 25 of Arms Act) at Police Station Shivaji Colony, District Rohtak.

2. On hearing counsel for the petitioner on 08.05.2025, the following order was recorded:

“(i) It is argued that incident took place on 06.01.2022, when petitioner fired shots upon ‘Jagdev’, who was related as real brother of the complainant ‘Robin’. Shots were fired by Akash @ Gitti, and Pankaj Budhwar @ Panku (petitioner herein).

Subsequently, petitioner has been arrested in the State of Delhi, in case FIR No.38, dated 14.02.2022, registered u/s 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, lodged at P.S. Special Cell Delhi, because one pistol along



with four live cartridges were recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

It is, thereupon, that the petitioner was taken into custody in the present case, because as per the case of the prosecution, bullets recovered in the present case, were found to be matched with the pistol recovered in the Delhi case. The factum of firing shots on the deceased in the present case, was disclosed by the petitioner in the disclosure statement, which was recorded there in the FIR No.38, registered under the Arms Act in the State of Delhi.

2. Considering the allegations, at this stage, this Court is not impressed with the submissions addressed by the petitioner's counsel, however, he points out that petitioner is there inside jail, in the present case, from 2022, and there is a list of 56 prosecution witnesses, but only 6/7 witnesses have been examined so far.

There being no chances of culmination of the process of recording of statements in the near future, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. There are total 8 accused and all of them are in custody. Therefore, trial Court is directed to submit its report, detailing therein, the reason of slow pace of the trial, especially, when all 8 accused, are inside jail.

4. For awaiting report, list on 31.07.2025.

5. Meanwhile, proceedings of recording of evidence of the prosecution witnesses be expedited also."

3. At the very out set, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to press the present petition at this stage.

4. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn at this stage.

21.01.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO