



CRM-M-68302-2025

1

135 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-68302-2025

Date of decision: 18.03.2026

SAHIL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Anshumaan Dalal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J (Oral):

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.556 dated 23.12.2024 registered under Section 103(1), 111(2), 111(3), 111(4), 111(5), 111(6) and 61 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 23.12.2024 at 02.40 AM, in the area of Sultanat Hotel Burjkotia District Panchkula, two unknown boys came in a car, opened indiscriminate fire as a result, Vineet @ Vicky, Tirth and Vandana @ Nia were hit by bullets in that firing. Later, they fled the spot with their car while firing in the air. During interrogation, name of petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of co-accused Manish Kali. In his statement, he stated that received a phone call from Aman @ Chinta who asked him to take both weapons and ammunition and go to



Panchkula. Then he along with Ashu, Deepak and Sahil in their kia Seltos car reached Panchkula via 152D Highway and on the instructions of Aman @ Chinta, the weapons and ammunition were allegedly handed over to Deepak Gahlot and Sahil Solanki, after which they returned.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has been nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused Manish Kali. He contends that the petitioner had merely accompanied the co-accused for the purpose of handing over the weapons, which fact has also been disclosed to the authorities. Apart from the present case the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. She further submits that out of total 83 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that apart from the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of crime; out of total 83 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far; the trial is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover,



CRM-M-68302-2025

3

‘bail is rule and jail is exception’.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

monika

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable : | Yes /No |