



CRM-M-22933-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22933-2024

Kamal Verma

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of decision: 25.02.2026**Date of Uploading : 25.02.2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Vikram Jeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG Punjab.
Mr. Gurcharan Dass, Advocate and
Mr. Bhirgu Dutt Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.22 dated 15.02.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 506, 34, 120-B of IPC and under Section 25, 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Dugri, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. The gravamen of the FIR reflects that the complainant namely Sukhmeet Singh Bhatia, an Advocate by profession, alleged that on 14.02.2024 at about 4:25 PM while he was returning home along with his minor nephew in his car, a white Nissan Magnite vehicle started following him. It has been alleged that the occupants of the said vehicle had intentionally brought their car in close proximity to the car of the complainant and thereafter when the complainant reached near Chik-Chik

Chowk, one of the assailants sitting on the front passenger seat took out a



CRM-M-22933-2024

2

pistol and fired multiple shots at him. It has been further alleged that one shot allegedly struck the complainant just below the right ear while two other shots hit the right side of his body. During the entire incident, the front glass of the car of the complainant was shattered and the complainant somehow managed to escape from the spot while the assailants continued firing and raised a *lalkara* that he was being taught a lesson today. It has been further alleged that the motive, as disclosed in the FIR, is on account of the matrimonial dispute between the complainant and his wife, whose brothers and relatives had allegedly extended threats to the complainant on earlier occasions also. On these set of allegations, the FIR in question was registered and investigation ensued.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question and has no role whatsoever in the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is an old and ailing person suffering from serious medical ailments including Coronary Artery Disease and Diabetes Mellitus. According to learned counsel, the petitioner has been implicated into the instant case only because he happens to be the father of co-accused Mohit Verma and father-in-law of another accused and there is no independent material to show his participation in the alleged occurrence. It has been further contended that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and his name surfaced only during the course of investigation on the basis of a supplementary statement and an alleged extra-judicial confession which is a weak piece of evidence. Furthermore, no recovery of any weapon or incriminating article has been effected from the petitioner and no overt act,



alleged occurrence. It has been further argued that the petitioner had no motive to participate in the alleged offence and has no connection with the complainant or the matrimonial dispute which is stated to be the root cause of the occurrence. It has been further submitted that the allegation of conspiracy is vague and omnibus and does not disclose any specific role played by the petitioner. According to learned counsel, the petitioner has been in custody since 22.02.2024 and the trial has not made any substantial progress. Although the challan has been presented and as many as 22 prosecution witnesses have been cited and 06 have been examined till date. Learned counsel has further submitted that since the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time, thus, no useful purpose would be served for continued incarceration of the petitioner. Furthermore, it has been contended that the petitioner is a old man and shall undertake to abide by all conditions that may be imposed by this Court, including not tampering with the prosecution evidence or influencing witnesses and not leaving the country without prior permission of the Court. On the strength of aforesaid submissions, the grant of petition in hand is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner by arguing that case in hand pertains to a heinous and premeditated attempt to commit murder carried out in broad daylight on a public road by using a firearm. According to learned State counsel, the manner in which the complainant was chased, intercepted and repeatedly fired upon clearly reflects the brutal and organised nature of the crime. Learned State counsel has iterated that although the petitioner was not named in the FIR, his involvement has surfaced during the course of



CRM-M-22933-2024

4

challan on the basis of material collected by the investigating agency, including the disclosure statements of co-accused and other corroborative evidence indicating his active participation in the conspiracy. According to learned State counsel, there is *prima facie* evidence against the petitioner showing his active involvement in the alleged offence. Furthermore, the investigation has been carried out in accordance with law and the material collected, including witness statements, clearly links the petitioner to the crime. Furthermore, the gravity of the offence is further aggravated by the fact that the complainant sustained firearm injuries on vital parts of the body and his minor nephew was also present in the vehicle at the time of the occurrence. Learned State counsel has emphasized that the trial is at a crucial stage and material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In view of the previous hostility between the parties, there is a strong likelihood that the petitioner, if released on bail, may influence or intimidate the witnesses. Considering the gravity of the offence and the specific role attributed to the petitioner, learned State counsel has prayed for the dismissal of the instant petition.

4.1. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has vociferously opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner and has raised submissions in tandem with the learned State counsel. Learned counsel have iterated that prior to the occurrence, the complainant and his family were repeatedly threatened by the co-accused persons that they could get him killed. According to learned counsel, the assailants has chased the vehicle of the complainant, intercepted him and fired multiple gunshots aimed at vital parts of his body which shows a clear intention to commit



CRM-M-22933-2024

5

occurrence, which is supported by the statements of witnesses and other material collected during the investigation. In view of the previous threats and the nature of the allegations, there is a genuine apprehension that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may try to influence or intimidate the complainant and other prosecution witnesses, thereby hampering the fair trial. On these grounds, learned counsel have prayed for the dismissal of the petition in hand.

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

6. The grant of bail falls within the discretionary domain of the court; however, such discretion must be exercised in a judicious and principled manner, ensuring it aligns with established legal precedents and the interests of justice. While considering a bail application, the Court must evaluate factors such as the existence of *prima facie* evidence implicating the accused, the nature and gravity of the alleged offence and the severity of the likely sentence upon conviction. The Court must also assess the likelihood of the accused absconding or evading the due process of law, the probability of the offence being repeated and any reasonable apprehension of the accused tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses. Additionally, the character, antecedents, financial means, societal standing, and overall conduct of the accused play a crucial role. Furthermore, the Court must weigh the potential danger of bail undermining the administration of justice or thwarting its due course. A profitable reference in this regard is made to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as *State through C.B.I. vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005 AIR Supreme*



“14. It is well settled that the matters to be considered in an application for bail are (i) whether there is any prima facie or reasonable ground to believe that the accused had committed the offence; (ii) nature and gravity of the charge; (iii) severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; (iv) danger of accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; (v) character, behaviour, means, position and standing of the accused; (vi) likelihood of the offence being repeated; (vii) reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with; and (viii) danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail (see **Prahlad Singh Bhati v. NCT, Delhi, 2001(2) RCR (Criminal) 377 (SC) : 2001(4) SCC 280** and **Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Administration), AIR 1978 Supreme Court 179**). While a vague allegation that accused may tamper with the evidence or witnesses may not be a ground to refuse bail, if the accused is of such character that his mere presence at large would intimidate the witnesses or if there is material to show that he will use his liberty to subvert justice or tamper with the evidence, then bail will be refused. We may also refer to the following principles relating to grant or refusal of bail stated in **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan, 2004(2) RCR (Criminal) 254 (SC) : 2004(7) SCC 528** : “The law in regard to grant or refusal of bail is very well settled. The court granting bail should exercise its discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Though at the stage of granting bail a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case need not be undertaken, there is a need to indicate in such orders reasons for prima facie concluding why bail was being granted particularly where the accused is charged of having committed a serious offence. Any order devoid of such reasons would suffer from non-application of mind. It is also necessary for the court granting bail to consider among other circumstances, the following factors also before granting bail; they are:

- a. The nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence.
- b. Reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.
- c. Prima facie satisfaction of the **court** in support of the charge. (see **Ram Govind Upadhyay v. Sudarshan Singh, 2002(2) RCR (Criminal) 250 (SC) : 2002(3) SCC 598** and **Puran v. Ram Bilas, 2001(2) RCR (Criminal) 801 (SC) : 2001(6) SCC 338**.”

This Court also in specific terms held that :

“the condition laid down under section 437(1)(i) is sine qua non for granting bail even under section 439 of the Code. In the impugned order



it is noticed that the High Court has given the period of incarceration already undergone by the accused and the unlikelihood of trial concluding in the near future as grounds sufficient to enlarge the accused on bail, in spite of the fact that the accused stands charged of offences punishable with life imprisonment or even death penalty. In such cases, in our opinion, the mere fact that the accused has undergone certain period of incarceration (three years in this case) by itself would not entitle the accused to being enlarged on bail, nor the fact that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future either by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration would be sufficient for enlarging the appellant on bail when the gravity of the offence alleged is severe and there are allegations of tampering with the witnesses by the accused during the period he was on bail."

In Panchanan Mishra v. Digambar Mishra, 2005(1) Apex Criminal 319 : 2005(1) RCR(Criminal) 712 (SC) : 2005(3) SCC 143, this Court observed :

"The object underlying the cancellation of bail is to protect the fair trial and secure justice being done to the society by preventing the accused who is set at liberty by the bail order from tampering with the evidence in the heinous crime..... It hardly requires to be stated that once a person is released on bail in serious criminal cases where the punishment is quite stringent and deterrent, the accused in order to get away from the clutches of the same indulge in various activities like tampering with the prosecution witnesses, threatening the family members of the deceased victim and also create problems of law and order situation."

7. Indubitably, the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature. The material which has come on record, at this stage, *prima facie* suggests that the petitioner specially attributed an active role in the occurrence. The allegations in the FIR disclose a pre-meditated and targeted attack upon the complainant. The manner in which the complainant was chased on a public road, the use of a firearm and the firing of multiple shots aimed at vital parts of the body clearly demonstrate an intention to cause death. The incident has taken place in a public area in a broad daylight, thereby endangering not only the life of the complainant and his minor



CRM-M-22933-2024

8

nephew but also that of general public. The seriousness of the allegations is further aggravated by the element of conspiracy emerging from the matrimonial discord and prior threats. At this stage, it cannot be said that the role attributed to the petitioner is insignificant. The present petitioner was not named in the FIR but during the course of investigation his name surfaced and has been included in the supplementary challan. As per the prosecution, the petitioner is the father of one of the principal accused Mohit Verma and played an active role in the conspiracy. The record further reflects that an independent witness has made a statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. that the petitioner has made an extra-judicial confession before him admitting that he, along with the co-accused, had hatched a plan to kill the complainant and the shooters were arranged in furtherance of the said conspiracy. It has also come on record that the petitioner is stated to have assisted the assailants by providing shelter and facilitating their movement. Furthermore, at the time of his arrest, the petitioner has thrown away a wallet which was found to contain identity documents of co-accused Mandeep Singh which *prima facie* indicate his association with the co-accused and his attempt to conceal the material evidence. At this stage, the Court is not required to examine the evidentiary value of the disclosure statements in detail. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* connects the petitioner with the conspiracy.

8. It is apt to mention herein that the offence is punishable under Section 307 IPC and the Arms Act and the complainant has suffered gunshot injuries. Such offences have a serious impact on society. The role attributed to the petitioner is not of a mere spectator but of a person acting in



possibility of the petitioner influencing the prosecution witnesses, many of whom are likely to be known to the parties due to the underlying matrimonial dispute, also cannot be brushed aside. The nature of the injuries suffered by the complainant, the use of a firearm and the alleged prior threats attributed to the petitioner in the conspiracy cumulatively indicate that the accusations are grave and supported by *prima facie* material. At this stage, this Court is not expected to meticulously examine the evidence. The material on record does not persuade this Court to hold that releasing the petitioner on bail at this juncture may adversely affect the progress of the trial.

9. At this stage, no accentuating circumstances have been made which may *prima facie* constitute a compelling ground for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, especially in light of the gravity of the allegations and the evidence on record. It is also to be borne in mind that offences of this nature strike at the very root of public order and societal conscience. Granting bail in such cases would not only undermine the gravity of the offence but may also embolden the accused. Further, there exists a strong likelihood that if enlarged on bail the petitioner may abscond to evade trial or attempt to influence, threaten, or intimidate prosecution witnesses particularly in light of his previous conduct of evading trial and being declared a proclaimed person.

10. Considering the gravity of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner in facilitating the conspiracy and the likelihood of his influencing the prosecution witnesses, this Court finds no merit in the present petition. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered opinion that



the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail in the factual *milieu* of the case in hand.

11. In view of the prevenient ratiocination, it is ordained thus:
- (i) The petition in hand is devoid of merits and is hereby dismissed.
 - (ii) Any observations made and/or submissions noted hereinabove shall not have any effect on merits of the case and the investigating agency as also the trial Court shall proceed further, in accordance with law, without being influenced with this order.
 - (iii) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 25, 2026
Ajay

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