

CRM-M-31162-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-31071-2026 (O&M)

1

215 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
259 AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:089292



Date of Decision: 02.07.2026

1. CRM-M-31162-2026 (O&M)

MANOJ @ JABBAL		... PETITIONER
	VERSUS	
STATE OF HARYANA		... RESPONDENT

2. CRM-M-31071-2026 (O&M)

SURINDER KUMAR @ SINDI		... PETITIONER
	VERSUS	
STATE OF HARYANA		... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Kumar Kashyap, Advocate for the petitioners.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This common order shall dispose of aforesaid two bail petitions.

2. The petitioners are seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (439 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No.556 dated 23.12.2024 registered under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 111(2)(A), 111(3), 111(4), 111(5), 111(6) of BNS (earlier Sections 302, 120-B IPC) and 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula, Haryana.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 23.12.2024 at 02.40 AM, in the area of Sultanat Hotel Burjkotia District Panchkula, 2-3 unknown boys came in a car, opened indiscriminate firing and caused the death of Vineet @ Vicky, Tirth and Vandana @ Niya. The incident is stated to be gang-driven. The role attributed to petitioner-Manoj Jabbal is that he conducted prior recce of deceased Vineet @ Vicky and passed the information to the main accused before the occurrence, whereas the role attributed to petitioner-Surinder Kumar

@ Sindi is that he also participated in pre-occurrence recce and logistical preparation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioners are not named in the FIR. The name of petitioners has emerged only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused made in custody. He further submits that the petitioners are in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days. He, thus, prays for grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioners on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates in the Court today and the same are taken on record. As per the custody certificates, the petitioners are in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days and out of total cited 101 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that petitioners have been nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused; the petitioners are in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days and out of total cited 101 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners

during the pendency of the trial.

8. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pardeep Kumar @ Banu versus State of Punjab*, bearing Criminal Appeal No.1341/2026 (arising out of SLP(Cri.) No.18775/2025), decided on 13.03.2026, wherein it has been categorically held that where the accused has remained in custody for a considerable period and the trial has not even commenced, or is not likely to conclude in the near future, therefore, continued incarceration would amount to punishment without trial. In such circumstances, further detention pending trial is not necessary and the accused is entitled to be released on bail.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioners are found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

02.07.2026

Janki

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