



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

132

CRM-M-73788-2025

VIKAS

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CRM-M-73636-2025

JITEN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

Decided on : 06.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Davinder Kaliraman, Advocate, for
Mr. Sanpreet Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-73788-2025), and
Mr. Parunjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-73636-2025).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-73788-2025 and CRM-M-73636-2025 shall stand disposed
of.
2. Petition i.e. CRM-M-73636-2025 is filed by the petitioner –
Jiten, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.131, dated
26.05.2025, under Sections 111(3), 111(4), 238(B), 48, 3(5) of BNS and



Sections 25(6), 29 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Rohtak Sadar, District Rohtak.

Petition i.e. CRM-M-73788-2025 is filed by the petitioner – Vikas, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.131, dated 26.05.2025, under Sections 3(5), 111(4), 111(3) of BNS and Section 25(6) of Arms Act and (Sections 238(b) of BNS and 29 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Rohtak, District Rohtak.

3. Case of the prosecution is that, on the basis of secret information received on 25.05.2025, police team conducted a raid at about 10:15 p.m. at the disclosed location. The secret information revealed the presence of accused-Tarun, son of Anil, resident of Village Kutabpur, Rewari, and accused-Mahesh @ Kalu, son of Ved Parkash, resident of Singhapura Khurd, Rohtak City. During raid, both the accused were found together on a motorcycle bearing registration No. HR-89-7705 and were allegedly preparing to commit a crime in Rohtak City. Both were apprehended, and from the right pocket of accused-Tarun's trousers, a black-coloured country-made pistol was recovered. The pistol was found unloaded; however, five live cartridges were recovered separately from its magazine.

From accused-Mahesh @ Kalu, one country-made pistol was recovered from the right pocket of the lower garment he was wearing. This pistol was also found unloaded, but four live cartridges were recovered from its magazine. The recovered pistols bore the inscription



“PIETRO BERETTA 7.65 MM” and on the other side the marking “USA ITALY.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners jointly submit that the two arrested accused had disclosed the name of another accused, namely Vikas (petitioner herein), and upon his arrest, one pistol was recovered from his possession.

It is further submitted that the accused Mahesh alias Kalu and Tarun, who were initially arrested, had also disclosed the name of another accused, namely Mohit. Subsequently, the said co-accused Mohit further disclosed the name of petitioner-Jiten. Upon arrest of petitioner-Jiten, two mobile phones were recovered from his possession.

5. Learned counsel further submit that petitioner-Jiten is in custody since 28.08.2025 and petitioner-Vikas is in custody since 07.06.2025.

As per the case of the prosecution, petitioners, in connivance with certain gangsters, are allegedly involved in demanding ransom. It is further submitted that charges have not yet been framed in the present case and, considering the likelihood of a protracted trial, learned counsel jointly pray for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificates dated 05.03.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.



As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner – Vikas has already undergone 08 months and 15 days period inside jail and petitioner – Jiten has already undergone 06 months and 05 days period inside jail.

7. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that offences alleged are grave in nature and petitioners have been named in disclosure statements made by the other co-accused, indicating their involvement in the conspiracy connected with extortion activities.

It is further submitted that investigation is at a crucial stage and release of the petitioners may lead to interference with evidence or influence on witnesses. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

8. This Court has heard learned counsel for both the respective parties and have considered the facts alleged in the FIR, as well as the investigation conducted by the prosecution.

9. Involvement of the present petitioners are not directly connected with the first-arrested accused, namely Tarun and Mahesh. Petitioners are implicated only on the disclosure statement of co-accused. Whether petitioners were actually involved in the alleged incident, whether they had any connection with other gangsters, and if so, whether such involvement was intentional or otherwise, are all matters to be examined by the trial Court during the course of trial.

10. Considering the totality of circumstances, and facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed



hereinabove, including the total period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioners and slow pace of trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to both the petitioners in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in both the present petitions is **allowed**. Petitioners – Vikas (in CRM-M-73788-2025) and Jiten (in CRM-M-73636-2025) are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

13. Both the petitions stand disposed of.

14. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

06.03.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO