

2026:PHHC:008704



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

242

**CRM-M-63884-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.01.2026**

Paramjeet Singh @ Meethi @ Badliya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 58 dated 31.01.2024, registered under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 120-B and 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sector 8, Faridabad. The first petition was dismissed as not pressed.

2. As per the allegations, Suraj Bhan, husband of the complainant Rajjo Devi was residing in a flat at Faridabad from the last six months. On 30.01.2024, she had come to meet him. In the evening time, her husband had gone to Gym. At about 6:45 PM, on receipt of intimation that her husband had been shot at by someone, she rushed to the spot and came to know that some unknown assailants had killed him. On her complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted. CCTV

2026:PHHC:008704



footage of the camera installed in the vicinity was collected and two youths were found opening indiscriminate firing upon the victim after alighting from a car. On the basis of the supplementary statement of the complainant and her son, the present petitioner and co-accused Nitin Narula were nominated as additional accused. The petitioner was arrested on 01.03.2024. He suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he had joined gang of gangster Kapil Sangwan @ Nandu, who wanted to eliminate the victim. They had hatched a conspiracy and in pursuance thereof, after his release on bail in a case qua which he was lodged in jail, he had done recce of the victim and had given intimation to Kapil Sangwan @ Nandu. He had also received a sum of Rs.2 Lakhs from one Amar Lochab and had given a pistol and aforesaid money to co-accused Atul for arranging shooters for killing the victim. Some other persons were also nominated as additional accused. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the supplementary statements of the complainant and her son, which were recorded after 22 days of the occurrence. It shows that such statements had been made after due deliberations and concoctions. The disclosure statement suffered by him cannot be considered to be admissible in the eyes of law. No recovery has been effected from him. He is in custody since 01.03.2024. Trial would take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Co-accused Nitin Narula @ Appu, Yogesh, Mohd. Faizal and Sachinder @ Mona have already been granted concession of bail by this Court. On parity, the petitioner too deserves to be given the same benefit. His involvement in other cases cannot be

2026:PHHC:008704



considered to be a reason for denying him concession of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his criminal antecedents, he is not entitled to be given the benefit of bail. It is, thus, urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the submissions made by both the sides.

6. The petitioner was not named in the FIR. He was in fact nominated as accused in this case on the basis of the supplementary statements recorded by the complainant and her son after 22 days of the occurrence. The role attributed to the petitioner is limited to facilitating the procurement of firearm and some money and supplying the same to co-accused Atul, who had further used it for killing the victim. The linkage sought to be established between the petitioner and the act of supply of arms, primarily rests on disclosure statement of the co-accused and circumstantial inferences and disclosure statement of the petitioner himself as there is no eyewitness to the occurrence. The role so attributed to him is that of a conduit or a facilitator in the purported procurement and supply of arms which is distinct and remote offence from the direct commission of offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC. This Court is conscious that the provision is serious, however, in present purposes, the Court must test whether the material against the petitioner justifies continued pre-trial incarceration bearing nature of evidence and the progress of the trial. Since the case against the petitioner rests upon supplementary statements of the complainant and her

2026:PHHC:008704



son, who were not eyewitnesses to the occurrence, this is a matter best left for trial whether the burden of proof and standard of evidence shall be applied rigorously. The petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2024. Conclusion of trial would obviously take considerable time. The co-accused, as mentioned above, have already been granted concession of bail by this Court. Pendency of other cases cannot be considered as a reason for denying bail to the petitioner in given circumstances. In view of the foregoing discussion, particularly the limited role is prescribed to the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that the continued detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall appear before the learned trial Court on each date of hearing unless exempted.
- (ii) he shall not tamper with evidence or attempt to influence witnesses in any manner.
- (iii) he shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

21.01.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No