



CRM-M-51302-2025

-1-

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

108

CRM-M-51302-2025

Date of decision : 09.04.2026

**MUNISH SHINGARI ALIAS MANU**

... PETITIONER

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA**

.. RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Anand, Advocate and  
Mr. Eshaan Seth, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. This second bail petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023, in case in FIR No.99 dated 11.03.2025, under Sections 109(1), 3(5), 61, 308(2), 111(2), 111(3), 111(4), 111(6) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Jagadhri City, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 11.03.2025, some boys opened fire at HS Liquor Shop near Bus Stand Jagadhri and the Security Guard of the shop, namely, Rai Singh sustained a gunshot injury. The complainant- Kulwant Rai (an employee of the said liquor Shop) stated that one boy entered the premises and started firing with a pistol. Rai Singh(Security Guard) fired back with his revolver, but the attacker, intending to kill him, fired again and one bullet struck Rai Singh on the right side of his head. It is further stated that another boy came at the spot and helped the accused escape.



CRM-M-51302-2025

-2-

3. During investigation, co-accused Vishal Singh and Gaurav Singh were arrested from them a motorcycle along with illegal weapons were recovered. Thereafter, Gaurav Singh in his disclosure statement named one-Kapil Vohra, who was already in custody in FIR No. 95 dated 10.02.2025. Thereafter, co-accused Kapil Vohra was arraigned as an accused. He was joined investigation through production warrants. Kapil Vohra, in his disclosure statement, named the present petitioner along with his brother-Tarun Singhari @ Tanu, stating that they had financed and conducted a recce prior to the alleged firing. Accordingly, the present petitioner was nominated in this case. It has also come on record that co-accused Gaurav Singh had demanded ransom from the owner of the said liquor vend, namely, Vinay Sahni.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Besides the disclosure statement, there is no incriminating material which would connect him with the alleged offence. Moreover, the said disclosure statement was made by the co-accused in police custody which cannot be relied upon or treated as admissible against the petitioner unless it is supported and corroborated by strong and independent evidence. It is further submitted that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and during police remand, the petitioner was compelled to sign blank pages as well as other pre-drafted documents. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 02 days. Although the petitioner is involved in other cases but he is on bail in most of them. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular

**CRM-M-51302-2025****-3-**

bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as only challan has been presented and the charges are yet to be framed.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 02 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only challan has been presented and the charges are yet to be framed.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 02 days, he was arraigned as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused which is yet to be corroborated and that the fact that the trial is likely to take a long time as only challan has been presented and the charges are yet to be framed, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



CRM-M-51302-2025

-4-

9.           However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 09, 2026  
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)  
JUDGE

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