

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

130

2026:PHHC:040424



Date of decision: 16.03.2026.

(1)

CRM-M-50966-2025 (O&M).

RAM DINESH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(2)

CRM-M-50788-2025 (O&M).

RAM DINESH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(3)

CRM-M-53718-2025 (O&M).

DIPIN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(4)

CRM-M-50191-2025 (O&M).

DIPIN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(5)

CRM-M-52858-2025 (O&M).

ANKIT ALIAS GURU

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(6)

CRM-M-54192-2025 (O&M).

ANKIT @ GURU

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(7)

CRM-M-54511-2025 (O&M).

RAHUL TOMAR

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(8)

CRM-M-54196-2025 (O&M).

RAHUL TOMAR

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(9)

CRM-M-56063-2025 (O&M).

YASH ALIAS PANDU

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(10)

CRM-M-56021-2025 (O&M).

YASH ALIAS PANDU

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

Present :- Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-50966-2025 and
CRM-M-50788-2025.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-56063-2025 and
CRM-M-56021-2025.

Mr. Ankit Karna, Advocate, and
Ms. Preeti Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-54196-2025 and
CRM-M-54511-2025.

Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-54192-2025 and
CRM-M-52858-2025.

Mr. Akash Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-50191-2025 and
CRM-M-53718-2025.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

All the aforesaid ten petitions, seeking the concession of regular bail by the respective petitioners, are being disposed of by this common order, as they arise out of the two FIRs registered in reference to the same occurrence and involve interconnected facts and issues.

2 The details of the cases and the respective FIRs wherein they have been filed are tabulated as under: -

Sr. No.	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of
---------	--	---

	Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.
1	CRM-M-50966-2025 titled as Ram Dinesh Vs. State of Haryana.	CRM-M-50788-2025 titled as Ram Dinesh Vs. State of Haryana.
2	CRM-M-53718-2025 titled as Dipin Vs. State of Haryana	CRM-M-50191-2025 titled as Dipin Vs. State of Haryana
3	CRM-M-54192-2025 titled as Ankit alias Guru State of Haryana	CRM-M-52858-2025 titled as Ankit alias Guru State of Haryana
4	CRM-M-54511-2025 titled as Rahul Tomar Vs. State of Haryana	CRM-M-54196-2025 titled as Rahul Tomar Vs. State of Haryana
5	CRM-M-56063-2025 titled as Yash alias Pandu Vs. State of Haryana	CRM-M-56021-2025 titled as Yash alias Pandu Vs. State of Haryana

3 For brief reference, the facts, are being taken from CRM-M-50966-2025 titled as Ram Dinesh Vs. State of Haryana.

4 Succinctly stated, the facts leading to the registration of FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024 on the statement made by the complainant Neeraj Gupta son of Rajender Gupta, resident of Hukam Chand Mandi, Gohana, are that he stated that he was running a sweet shop under the name and style of “**Lala Maturam Rajender Prasad**” situated near Shiv Chowk, Purani Anaj Mandi, Gohana. According to the complainant, on 21.01.2024 at about 10:30

a.m., while he along with his staff was present at the shop and his younger brother Raman was sitting at the cash counter, three unidentified persons, with their faces covered, arrived on a motorcycle from the side of Old Anaj Mandi, Gohana and stopped in front of the shop. It is alleged that the said persons opened indiscriminate fire, firing approximately 30 to 40 rounds, most of which were directed towards the shop and with an intention to kill. It was further alleged that at that time Bijender, a resident of village Mahara, who had come to the shop for supplying milk, was also fired upon by the assailants. The complainant stated that while fleeing from the spot, the assailants threw a note in front of the shop demanding a ransom of Rs.2 crores and threatened that in the event the said amount was not arranged, they would kill the person running the shop. The complainant further stated that the identity of the assailants could not be ascertained as their faces were covered and sought appropriate legal action against the unknown persons, whereupon the above FIR came to be registered.

5 Succinctly stated, the facts leading to the registration of FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, on the basis of the statement made by Bijender son of Krishan, resident of village Mahra, District Sonipat, are that on 21.01.2024, at about 10:30 a.m., he had gone to deliver milk at the shop of Lala Matu Ram Halwai (Confectioner) at Gohana. It is alleged that at that time, three unknown persons arrived on a motorcycle from the side of the Old Grain Market and after positioning themselves near the idol of Lord Shiva, opened indiscriminate fire towards the shop of Lala Matu Ram Halwai. The complainant stated that, upon hearing the gunshots, he got frightened and attempted to run inside the shop, during which he sustained a gunshot injury

on the right side of his head. It was further stated that thereafter, the driver of Lala Matu Ram Halwai transported him to PGI, Khanpur Kalan for medical treatment, where he was provided first aid by the attending doctor. The complainant further stated that he subsequently came to know that the assailants had fled from the spot towards the side of the Grain Market. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the complainant sought appropriate legal action against the three unknown persons, whereupon the present FIR came to be registered.

6 The details of the role attributed to each of the petitioner’s hereinabove is as under: -

Sr. No.	Case No.	Title	FIR No	Role attributed
1	CRM-M-50966-2025	RAM DINESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Hosted a meeting at his residence where the conspiracy was allegedly finalized. • Provided the pen and paper used for preparing the extortion slips. • A notebook recovered from him contained imprints of the

	CRM-M-50788-2025	RAM DINESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	same message used at the crime scene. • Conducted recce of the target location prior to the incident. • Assisted in procuring the motorcycle used in the commission of the offence.
2	CRM-M-53718-2025	DIPIN V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Participated in the planning meeting held at the residence of Ramdinesh. • Assisted in drafting the extortion slips demanding Rs.2 crores. • Conducted surveillance (recce) of Maturam shop prior to the incident.
	CRM-M-50191-2025	DIPIN V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Guided the assailants regarding entry and exit routes. • Assisted in procuring the motorcycle used in the commission of the offence.

3	CRM-M-52858-2025	ANKIT ALIAS GURU V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Conducted recce along with co-accused Rohit. • Assisted Raman in delivering the stolen car used in the commission of the offence. • Facilitated transfer of extortion money as part of the conspiracy.
	CRM-M-54192-2025	ANKIT @ GURU V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	
4	CRM-M-54511-2025	RAHUL TOMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Owner/driver of the Scorpio vehicle used for transporting weapons. • Accompanied co-accused Harvinder and Raman to deliver weapons to Rohit. • Assisted in transferring extortion money.

	CRM-M-54196-2025	RAHUL TOMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	
5	CRM-M-56063-2025	YASH ALIAS PANDU V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 285, 307, 384, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109, 111, 386, 387, 412 and 507 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	• Associated with co-accused through Lakshay (cousin of Sahil). • Roommate of accused Rahul during college. • Engaged in communication with other accused persons involved in the offence. • Assisted in transferring money related to the incident. • Allegedly involved in other criminal cases. • Recovery of mobile phone and ₹4,000/- from his possession.
	CRM-M-56021-2025	YASH ALIAS PANDU V/S STATE OF HARYANA	FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, (Sections 120-B, 109 and 111 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.	

7 Counsel for the petitioners contend that in the aforesaid incident

of firing at the shop of complainant Neeraj Gupta resulting in FIR No.22, one Bijender had also suffered injuries for which a separate FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024 under Sections 307 and 34 of the IPC (Section 120-B, 109 and 111 of IPC and Sections 25 and 29 of the Arms Act, added later on) was also registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat.

8 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) submit that the petitioners have been in custody since April/May 2024 and have undergone an actual custody of nearly 02 years. It is further contended that the trial has made negligible progress. In FIR No. 22 dated 21.01.2024, out of a total of 84 prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been examined so far, whereas in FIR No. 23 dated 21.01.2024, out of 45 witnesses, only five witnesses have been examined till date. Learned counsel further submit that none of the petitioners, except Rukumuddin, are involved in any other criminal case apart from the instant two FIRs. Insofar as petitioner Rukumuddin is concerned, it is stated that he had been nominated as an accused in FIR No. 266 registered at Police Station Sadar, Gohana, however, he has already been acquitted in the said case vide judgment dated 17.12.2022.

9 It is contended that the petitioner(s) herein are alleged to be the co-conspirators in the incident of firing at the shop of Neeraj Gupta (complainant in FIR No.22) wherein the victim Bijender was incidentally caught in the cross-fire as he attempted to enter into the shop. The petitioner herein never actually participated in the act of firing at the spot. It is further contended that at the time of the incident, the petitioners were of young age. Petitioner Yash @ Pendu was about 18 years, petitioner Rahul about 19 years, petitioner Ankit @ Guru about 20 years, petitioner Deepak about 23 years and

petitioner Ram Dinesh was about 28 years of age. It is further submitted that even though it is alleged that some of the petitioners assisted in handling extortion money, however, the FIR does not disclose that any extortion money was ever paid. Besides, no ransom money, if any, has ever been recovered. There is also no description of the day, month, year, time or the amount which was allegedly paid.

10 Learned counsel submits that, keeping in view the youthful age of the petitioners, their clean criminal antecedents, and the absence of any direct role attributed to them in the commission of the overt act of firing or for seeking ransom coupled with the stage of the trial and the period of custody already undergone, the petitioners deserve to be considered for the grant of concession of regular bail.

11 Learned state counsel, on the other hand, contends that the petitioners have been found to be co-conspirators acting in concert with the main accused, and that they were actively involved in extending assistance in the execution of the offence, including the firing of the gun shots at the premises of complainant Neeraj Gupta. It is contended that during the course of the occurrence, approximately 50 rounds were fired and a ransom demand of Rs.2 crores was also raised on behalf of Himanshu @ Bhau and that in a social media post, the above gang had also undertaken responsibility of the said incident. It is also pointed out that one of the persons present at the spot, namely Bijender, sustained injuries in the said firing incident, in respect of which a separate FIR has been registered. It is further contended that since the petitioners had extended logistical and operational support to the main accused, their role cannot be treated as peripheral.

12 Learned state counsel, however, does not dispute the period of custody undergone by the petitioners, the lack of criminal antecedents apart from present incident as well as absence of any substantive recovery from the petitioners except for certain cash and mobiles. It is also fairly conceded that neither the weapons used in the commission of the offence nor the vehicles involved in the occurrence were recovered pursuant to the disclosure statements from the present petitioners.

13 Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioners, the role attributed to them, the absence of criminal antecedents; the period of actual custody of nearly 02 years and the fact that no substantive recovery of weapons or vehicles used in the incident has been effected either from the possession of the petitioners or pursuant to their disclosure statements, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petitions. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

14 It is made clear that in the event of the petitioners misusing the concession of bail and on being involved in any other case of such or similar nature, the State shall be at liberty to move an application seeking cancellation of bail granted to the petitioners. It is further made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence or intimidate any prosecution witnesses in any manner, directly or indirectly.

15 The observation made hereinabove shall be not construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case

on the basis of available material.

16 Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed
of accordingly.

17 A photocopy of the order be placed on the connected file(s).

March 16, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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