



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-60067-2025
Date of decision: 20.01.2026

AKSHIT @ SEETUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0063 dated 28.02.2025, registered under Section(s) 109(1), 3(5), 333, 351(3) and 61 of BNS and Sections 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sector-17, HUDA, Jagadhri, District Yamunanagar.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 27.02.2025 at about 09:00 p.m., the accused persons, acting in furtherance of common intention, entered the house of the complainant while armed with country-made pistols. It is alleged that accused Manni fired a shot at the complainant's mother-Meena Rani, which struck her on the right arm. Another co-accused

Varun is stated to have fired a shot aimed at the complainant, which grazed past his head and hit the wall. The remaining co-accused Purushottam and Honey are also alleged to have opened fire with an intention to kill.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the aforesaid FIR and has no concern with the alleged occurrence. He was neither named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him. His name cropped upon the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused which is not corroborated by any recovery. The only attribution against the petitioner is that he was part of the conspiracy and was present in the Hotel at the time of alleged incident of firing on the complainant's side. He submits that co-accused Purushottam, Krishanpal @ Honey, who were alleged to fire gunshots alongwith one Ankur Kumar and Johny Poswal specifically named in the FIR had been declared innocent by the Police which reflects at the false implication by the complainant side. It is further contended that there is no direct or substantive evidence available to link the petitioner with the incident in any manner whatsoever. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 25.04.2025. He submits that the trial has not made much progress and only 02 witnesses out of a total of 31 witnesses have been examined so far. It is further contended that another co-accused i.e. Abhishek @ Pahari has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 14.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-56334 of 2025.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the role attributed to the petitioner, the period of custody already undergone, absence of recovery as well as the stage of trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

JANUARY 20, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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