

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-69523-2025 (O&M)

2026.PHHC.033071



Abhishek Thukral @ Abbu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	26.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	06.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	06.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Dharam Pal Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. :-

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 376 dated 14.06.2025, registered under Sections 103(1), 3(5), 111(2)(a), 111(2)(b), 111(3), 112(1)(5) and 61 of BNS, 2023 and

Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra.

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, a post had appeared on Instagram by a gangster Noni Rana, thereby taking responsibility for the murder of the victim Shantanu. Accused Shubham Khurana was arrested on 19.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also disclosed that the present petitioner and his brother Anuj Thukral were in contact with accused Sandeep @ Lota, who was a member of a gang of gangster Noni Rana and was lodged in jail. They were transferring money in the bank account of accused Sandeep @ Lota and had been

facilitating making of ransom calls by the gangsters by providing details of the liquor vendors etc. from whom money could be extracted. On the basis of this disclosure statement, the present petitioner was nominated as accused and was arrested on 20.06.2025. He too suffered disclosure statement admitting that he was in contact with accused Sandeep Lota, who was a member of gangs of Noni Rana and Lawrence Bishnoi, and used to meet the said Sandeep @ Lota in jail and also used to supply him information` about the liquor vendors and had also been passing information to accused Sandeep @ Lota for eliminating the victim Shantanu. Subsequently, some other persons were also nominated as co-accused and were arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No specific role has been attributed to him. He was not named in the FIR. The disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was illegally picked up by the police and had been kept in illegal confinement from 18.06.2025 to 20.06.2025. The disclosure statement, which has been allegedly extracted from him, is also of no relevance. Co-accused Sachin Kumar, Mohit Kumar and Dipender Pal Singh @ Kirat have already been extended benefit of regular bail by this Court. On parity, he too deserves to be given the same benefit. There is no material on record to connect him with the offences punishable under Sections 111(2), 111(3) and 111(5) of BNS, 2023. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. It is, therefore, urged that he

deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature as he was a part of the conspiracy allegedly hatched with the co-accused and was a member of the gang of Noni Rana gangster. In pursuance of the conspiracy, the petitioner had been supplying information about the whereabouts of the victim as well as other liquor vendors and businessmen to the accused Sandeep @ Lota, who was lodged in jail. He had been visiting jail with the wife of accused Sandeep @ Lota for the purpose of passing on such information and facilitating the commission of subject offences. Even on 04.06.2025, he had met accused Sandeep @ Lota in District Jail, Kurukshetra and this fact stands affirmed from the visitors details record of the accused Sandeep @ Lota. It is further argued that the murder of the victim Shantanu had been planned by the petitioner along with co-accused. Material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of the petitioner's extending threat to them, committing similar offences or absconding, if released on bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

7. The linkage sought to be established between the petitioner and the murder of the victim Shantanu primarily rests upon the disclosure statement of co-accused and circumstantial inferences. The role that has been attributed to him is that of a conduit or a facilitator by providing information to the accused Sandeep @ Lota regarding names and other particulars of the rich persons, so that ransom money could be demanded from them by the gang

of gangster Noni Rana. As per the allegations, he was a part of the organized crime syndicate and used to regularly visit District Jail, Kurukshtra to meet accused Sandeep @ Lota, who was an active member of Noni Rana gang and was confined in jail. Along with the status report, personal visitors details of the accused Sandeep @ Lota as prepared by the concerned jail, have been annexed to show that the petitioner had visited accused Sandeep @ Lota on 04.06.2025. However, on a perusal of this report, it is clear that it was the wife of accused Sandeep @ Lota, namely Poonam, who had gone to visit him on 04.06.2025 and the name of the petitioner has not been mentioned therein. The role that has been attributed to the petitioner is distinct and remote offence from the direct commission of offence of murder. This Court is conscious that the offence 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 petitioner was not named in the FIR and the case against him rests upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused or his own disclosure statement, hence, in the opinion of this Court, 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 20.06.2025. In view of the foregoing discussion, particularly the limited role as 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.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No