

CRM-M-63428-2025 ::1::

(143-3)
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-63428-2025
Date of Decision: 30.03.2026

Amandeep @ Aman

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI


Present: Mr. Deepak Jaglan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in this second petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.98 dated 18.06.2024 registered under Sections 148, 149, 341, 307, 302, 34 and 120-B IPC and Sections 25(1) (B)(a) of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Naggal, District Ambala.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the main accused is Surya Partap @ Surya who fired at the deceased. The petitioner is not named in the FIR but has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the statement of Diljan Singh @ Gurjant Singh and Pardeep. No injury has been attributed to him. Two similarly situated co-accused, namely, Gurdass Singh @ Maathu and Sahil have been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders dated 18.09.2025 and 30.10.2025 (Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively). As the petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2024 but only 01

**CRM-M-63428-2025**


::2::

out of the 38 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned State counsel, on the other hand, while referring to the status report dated 22.01.2026 which is on record, contends that all the accused were forming an unlawful assembly and attacked the deceased and one of the accused, namely, Surya Partap @ Surya fired a fatal shot at the deceased-Gurpreet Singh and also caused gun shot injuries on the person of Diljan Singh @ Gurjant Singh. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner do not entitle him to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and even in the statement of the witnesses, no injury has been attributed to him, that two co-accused, namely, Gurdass Singh @ Maathu and Sahil have been granted the concession of bail, that the petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2024 and that only 01 out of the 38 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner is not named in the FIR. During the course of the investigation, the statements of the witnesses were recorded wherein no injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The culpability of the petitioner with the aid of Section 149 IPC shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Two similarly situated co-accused have been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders dated 18.09.2025 and 30.10.2025 (Annexures P-3 and P-4 respectively). The petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2024 but only 01 out of the 38 prosecution witnesses has



CRM-M-63428-2025 ::3::

been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner-Amandeep @ Aman is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. If any attempt whatsoever is made by the petitioner and/or his family members/friends to contact/threaten/intimidate any of the witnesses of the present occurrence, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.

9. The petition stands disposed of.

30.03.2026
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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