

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:022242



235

CRM-M-66104-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:12.02.2026

Ikshan Singh Mehta @ Ekshan Singh Mehta

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sumit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.376, dated 14.06.2025, registered under Sections 103(1), 3(5), 61(2), 111(2)(3)(5) of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Shahabad, District Ambala.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint submitted by the complainant Prince alleging that he was working as a driver with the liquor contractor Shantanu from the last one month. On the evening of 13.06.2025, he along with Aniket, another employee of the liquor vend and Shantanu was going towards Shahbad. He

had stopped his vehicle at Meena Market, Shahbad on asking of Shantanu. The latter had alighted from the vehicle and was proceeding towards a shop to buy cigarette, when suddenly two youths reached from behind on a motorbike and one of them started firing shots upon him. Seeing them, the complainant hit both of them with his vehicle due to which the assailants also sustained injuries and fled while leaving their motorbike at the spot. The injured Shantanu was rushed to hospital who succumbed to the injuries and died. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, on 14.06.2025, by making a post on Instragram App, one Noni Rana gang took responsibility for murder of victim Shantanu. During the course of investigation, accused Shubham Khurana was nominated as accused. He was arrested and suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also that accused Noni Rana had shared with him that the arms/ammunition and vehicle for the purpose of killing the victim would be arranged by the present petitioner, co-accused Anas resident of Village Milk Majra and Prabhjot Singh. On his disclosure statement, the present petitioner was nominated as an additional accused and was arrested on 25.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting that he was a member of gang of gangsters Noni Rana and Badal Heer, who had hatched a conspiracy to kill the victim Shantanu. He further disclosed that in pursuance of that conspiracy, one motorbike was to be stolen, its identity was to be got changed from accused Mohit Kumar and the same was to be retained by him. He disclosed that he along with accused Harneet Singh and Harman Singh had brought an Apache make motorbike, which was having false

number plates from the shop of Mohit and had kept the same along with some fake number plates in the house of Harneet Singh. As per his disclosure statement, on 10.06.2025, that motorbike, 02 fake number plates and 02 pistols were supplied at village Sudail. He disclosed that on the night of 13.06.2025, on asking of accused Harneet Singh, he along with former, had proceeded for Saharanpur to harbour safe escape of Romi Vohra and accused Romil Vohra, who had committed murder of the victim but had dropped on the way. Some other arrests were also made. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. Many co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. He was neither present at the time of murder of the victim nor any specific overt act leading to the homicidal death of the victim has been attributed to him. No recovery has been effected from him. His antecedents are clean. There are no chances of his absconding. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner is a member of an organized criminal gang engaged in committing serious crimes and being a part of the conspiracy hatched by the co-accused, the petitioner had facilitated providing of vehicle and arms to be used by the assailants for killing the victim on the fateful night and had also harboured the assailant Romil vohra. There are chances of his absconding or influencing the witnesses if extended

the benefit of bail. Accused Noni Rana @ Surya Pratap, Badal Heer and Anil Kumar @ Monu Gujjar are yet to be arrested. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. As per the allegations, the petitioner by becoming a part of conspiracy headed by the co-accused, facilitated receipt of one motorbike with 02 false number plates from accused Mohit and supply of the same at some other place for the purpose of using the same for committing murder of victim. As per further allegations, he also facilitated escape of the assailant Romil Vohra from place of occurrence, by taking him in a car belonging to co-accused Harneet Singh. Call detail records of the cell phones of the petitioner and co-accused Harneet Singh have been collected during the course of investigation, which reveal that tower location of their phones was same at the relevant point of time. Even on 14.06.2025, the tower location of their mobile phones has matched with the CCTV footage of car of the accused Harneet Singh, which was seen at toll plaza, Sarsawa. Petitioner has been linked with the offence on the basis of conspiracy hatched with the co-accused. He might not be directly involved in the murder of victim, however, the allegations qua harbouring of the assailants and arranging the weapon of offence as well as vehicle, have been specifically levelled against him, which are serious in nature. Taking into consideration, the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be allowed at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that nothing stated above shall have any bearing on merits of the case.
10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

12.02.2026

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

harjeet

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