



CRM-M-54598-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-58162-2025 (O&M)

1

119 (2 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54598-2025 (O&M)

Jaideep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CRM-M-58162-2025 (O&M)

Manishankar Shukla

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Decided on: 21.04.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-54598-2025)

Mr. Sapan Dhir, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-58162-2025)

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of this common order, both the above-mentioned petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.
2. All the above mentioned accused namely—(i) Jaideep and (ii) Manishankar Shukla have filed bail petitions under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the



CRM-M-54598-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-58162-2025 (O&M)

pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
76	09.03.2025	110, 117(2) of BNS (challan under Sections 103(1), 117(2) BNS)	DLF Phase III, Gurugram	Gurugram

3. The FIR in the instant case was got registered by complainant – Naveen Kumar Singh and same reads as under:

“I am Naveen Kumar Singh, son of Mithlesh Singh, address village Dholi, Police Station bake bazar, District Gaya, Bihar, currently a tenant of Subhash's house, street number 27, village Nathupur, Gurugram. And for almost 15 years, I have been driving CNG auto No. HR55AS6465 on rent from Shubham. Similarly, my uncle's son Sonu, son of Mrityunjay Singh, also drives CNG auto No. HR55V1102 on rent from Shubham, On march 8, 2025, I arrived at block lane no.27, village Nathupur, around 2 AM in the morning from ambience mall, Gurugram. When I arrived near Mahadev Rasoi in lane no.27, I saw my brother Sonu lying unconscious in his auto-rickshaw, Shubham was standing beside him. I asked Shubham what had happened to Sonu, Shubham told me that a short while ago, a boy named Jaideep, who rents a kitchen in lane no.28 and works as an online food supplier, was walking from his kitchen through lane no.27 towards village nathupur. Sonu was standing in the street a little further from Mahadev rasoi with his auto rickshaw. Jaideep and Sonu suddenly had an argument and verbal abuse about moving the auto rickshaw out of the street. Jaideep enraged pushed sonu during the scuffle. Sonu fell headfirst onto the street, hitting his head on stone pieces buried in the soil. Sonu sustained a severe injury to the back of his head and he fell unconscious. I then took my brother Sonu in my rented auto, with the help of AtishKumar and Rajesh, son of Suresh Paswan from my village, to the government hospital, sector 10 Gurugram for treatment. After providing him with primary treatment, they referred him to Safdarjung hospital, Delhi. I then took him to Safdarjung Hospital Delhi, for treatment and got him admitted. My brother sonu is still unconscious. Jaideep attacked and injured him with a life threatening injury. Strict legal action should be taken against Jaideep. I have now come to the police station and made the complaint.”



**CRM-M-54598-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-58162-2025 (O&M)**

3

4. It is being argued that as per initial recording in the death summary, deceased-Sonu at the time of examination was recorded as intoxicated with fall backwards.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that on direction of this Court, fresh status report dated 14.01.2026 has been filed on record.

As per CCTV footage even petitioner(s) could not be identified. Referring paragraph No. 4 and 5 of the status report, counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that as per CCTV footage, assault is noticed to have been given to the victim Sonu, however, as to who was the person causing injuries could not be ascertained. Further more, during the course of recording of evidence eye-witness Rajesh appeared as PW-2 on 12.09.2025 and in examination-in-chief, he clearly stated that some unknown persons were giving fist and leg blows to Sonu. Similar is the statement of another eye-witness Shubham in his statement dated 12.09.2025 that some unknown persons were giving fist and leg blows to Sonu. Learned counsel further submit that petitioners are inside jail since 09.03.2025 (i.e. for last more than a period of 01 year, 1 month and 12 days). He further submits that out of total 35 prosecution witnesses, 08 witnesses stand examined, however, statements of 27 prosecution witnesses are yet to be recorded by the trial Court, which definitely would consume considerable time. Two of the star prosecution witnesses produced by the prosecution i.e. Rajesh and Shubam have not supported case of the prosecution.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail, submitting that the petitioner(s) are involved in a serious offence. Learned State



**CRM-M-54598-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-58162-2025 (O&M)**

4

counsel also expresses concern that if the petitioner(s) are released on bail, they may try to influence witnesses or interfere with the trial. Even so, the State prays for dismissal of the present petition.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the record.

8. Considering the total incarceration period and the fact that eye-witness have failed in identifying the petitioner as assailants, and the fact of turning hostile would be examined by the trial Court, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition(s) is allowed. Petitioners namely, (i) Jaideep and (ii) Manishankar Shukla are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Both the petitions stand disposed of.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

21.04.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No