

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

130

2026.PHHC.040718



Date of decision: 16.03.2026.

(1)

CRM-M-52736-2025 (O&M)

RAMAN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

(2)

CRM-M-53174-2025 (O&M)

RAMAN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The aforesaid two petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

CRM-M-52736-2025 has been filed for seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 109, 111, 285, 307, 386, 387, 412, 506, 507, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Panipat.

Succinctly stated, the facts leading to the registration of FIR No.22 dated 21.01.2024 are that the same was recorded on the basis of the statement made by the complainant Neeraj Gupta son of Rajender Gupta, resident of Hukam Chand Mandi, Gohana, who 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 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 present FIR came to be registered.

CRM-M-53174-2025 has been filed for seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024, under Section(s) 109, 111, 307, 386, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Gohana City, District Panipat

Succinctly stated, the facts leading to the registration of FIR No.23 dated 21.01.2024 are that the same was recorded on the basis of the statement made by Bijender son of Krishan, resident of village Mahra, District Sonipat. According to the complainant, 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.

Status report already filed on behalf of the respondent-State in each of the case is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a young individual aged about 22 years and has already undergone actual custody of more than two years in the present case. It is further contended that the trial has not made any substantial progress thus far and is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Learned counsel also submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner in the prosecution case, inasmuch as there is no allegation that the petitioner himself fired any shot or caused any specific injury to any person during the occurrence in question.

Learned State counsel, however, submits that the petitioner Raman has, during the course of investigation, disclosed his close association with co-accused Sahil and Himanshu @ Bhau, who are stated to be dreaded gangsters in the area. It is contended that the petitioner was actively involved in receiving instructions through electronic platforms such as WhatsApp and Signal and had allegedly agreed to execute the assigned tasks on the inducement of being sent abroad. It is further submitted that the petitioner was involved in facilitating the transportation of a Honda City car as well as a bag containing weapons and had delivered the same to co-accused Rohit. Learned State counsel points out that subsequently, upon search of the premises of the said co-accused Rohit, the weapons were recovered. He contends that notwithstanding the age of the petitioner, he has past history of involvement

in multiple cases. Apart from the present two FIRs, petitioner herein is also involved in other criminal cases bearing FIR No.69 of 2024 under Sections 302, 411, 420, 483, 201, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and under Sections 25 and 27(3) of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Murthal and FIR No.51 dated 02.02.2024, under Sections 186, 307, 332, 353, 411, 420, 474, 427 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Kharkhoda.

I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties at length, perused the documents appended with the present petitions and considered the rival submissions advanced.

From the material placed on record, it emerges that the role attributed to the petitioner is not merely peripheral but that of a key conspirator, who acted as the link between co-accused Sahil and Himanshu @ Bhau, both stated to be involved in organized criminal activities. The prosecution case, at this stage, indicates that the petitioner was instrumental in facilitating communication, coordination and execution of the alleged criminal act. He was thus the mastermind behind carrying out the entire operation of extortion and indiscriminate firing at the premises of the complainant, during which Bijender also sustained gunshot injuries, leading to the registration of FIR No. 23. It is further evident from the record that the petitioner is also involved in two other serious criminal cases, including offences punishable under Sections 302 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code, which prima facie reflect a pattern of conduct suggestive of continued engagement in criminal activities. Therefore, the cumulative circumstances, indicate that the petitioner has not been incidentally implicated but has consciously chosen the path of crime as a career.

Thus, having regard to the repeated involvement of the petitioner in serious criminal cases, including offences of a heinous and grave nature such as murder and attempt to murder, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage. The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

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.

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