CNR No: PHHC011210542026
2026:PHHC:128611

(229)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42490-2026
Date of decision :10.09.2026

MANISH ALIAS AMAN PANDIT

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate with
Mr. Ankush Sihag, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, Asstt. A.G., Haryana.

****

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.98 dated 18.06.2024 registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 34, 341, 120-B, 307 of IPC (Sections 191(3), 190, 103, 3(5), 126(2), 61(2), 109 of BNS, 2023) and Section 25(1-B)(a) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Naggal, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. In brief, relevant facts of the prosecution case are that complainant Mohit got recorded his statement to police to the effect that his younger brother Gupreet Singh used to sit at the shop with him. On 18.06.2024, when he was at home, his brother Gurpreet Singh had also come home to eat food. In the meantime, Pardeep son of Pola Ram and Gurjant Singh @ Diljan Singh son of Baljeet Singh came on a motorcycle. At about 01:00 – 01:15 PM, Gurpreet Singh, Pardeep and

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Gurjant had gone on the said motorcycle to the house of his maternal uncle Gulab Singh resident of village Baknaur. At about 03:15 – 03:30 PM, his neighbourer Rahul told him that Pardeep had telephonically told him that Gurpreet Singh and Gurjant Singh were shot due to which Gurpreet Singh had died and he was taking Gurjant Singh for treatment in hospital. On this, he along-with his family members reached at the spot where dead body of his brother Gurpreet Singh was lying. He came to know that Karni son of Satta @ Satpal, Jassi, Sukha and Aman @ Pandit alongwith 4-5 other persons armed with deadly weapons had restrained the way of his brother Gurpreet Singh, Gujant Singh @ Diljan Singh and Pardeep Kumar and attacked upon them due to old enmity. On this, the FIR was registered.

3. During the course of investigation, the statement of eye witness Pradeep Singh S/o Pola Ram R/o Village Danipur, District Ambala was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. dated 22.06.2024 wherein the names of accused persons came forth namely Surya Pratap resident of village Bamba, Gurdas alias Mathu resident of village Baknor, Sahil alias Shanti resident of village Baknor, Ramkaran alias Karni resident of village Baknor, Jasbir alias Jassi resident of village Metala, Amandeep resident of village Metala, Nitin resident of village Metala and Aman resident of village Metala and Aman Pandit. It was stated that Aman Pandit called Gurpreet Singh (deceased) and asked him to meet him (Aman Pandit) so as to return his (Gurpreet's Singh) money.

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

During investigation, on 23.06.2024 Surya Pratap and Ram Karan were arrested by the police and furthermore on 24.06.2024 the abovenamed accused person suffered their disclosure statements. Thereafter, on 25.06.2024 the other co-accused Jasbir Singh @ Jassi, Amandeep Singh @ Aman, Gurdas Singh @ Mathu, Sahil @ Shanty and Manish @ Aman Pandit were apprehended.

In Pursuance of the disclosure statement of Surya Pratap got recovered the pistol which was used in the commission of the crime and the motorcycle Splendor Plus + RC (Regd. No.HR-01AM-4169) which were taken into police possession vide recovery memo as evidence. During further investigation the recoveries were made in pursuance of the disclosure statement made by Ram Karan-Wooden Binda (36.5 inch length) and motorcycle Bullet Enfield 350 Classic (HR-01AM-4477) which were taken into police possession vide recovery memo as evidence.

4. The counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has not been attributed any direct or overt act of assault or violence in the murder of Gurpreet Singh alias Gullu or the alleged injuries caused to Gurjant Singh alias Diljan Singh. At best, it could be said that he was coordinating and informing the accused persons of the location of the deceased. The co-accused of the petitioner, namely Gurdas Singh alias Mathu, Sahil @ Shanty and Amandeep alias Aman have been granted the concession of bail. As the petitioner is in custody since 26.06.2024 but

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

none of the 30 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. Therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

5. A reply dated 07.09.2026 by way of an affidavit of Vijay Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police Headquarters, Ambal, District Ambala has been filed on behalf of the State by the learned counsel for the State. The same is taken on record. While referring to the reply, he contends that the petitioner is the person who called the deceased to the place of occurrence and as such, his role is pivotal to the commission of the offence. He was in touch with not only the deceased, but also with the accused party, so as to lure the deceased. Further, the co-accused of the petitioner, namely Gurdas Singh alias Mathu, Sahil @ Shanty and Amandeep alias Aman, who have been granted bail, were not named in the FIR but came to be nominated as accused during the course of the investigation. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. The relevant extract of the State's reply dated 07.09.2026, is as under:-

> *"24. That as far as the role of the accused-petitioner in the commission of the present crime is concerned, during investigation, upon examination of disclosure statements of the accused persons and other material available on the case file, it was found that the petitioner was in constant contact with the co-accused persons and had played an*

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

active role in calling the deceased towards the place and informing the co-accused persons regarding his arrival and movement. The petitioner was thus an important link in the execution of the criminal conspiracy. The allegations against the petitioner are serious and grave in nature. There is sufficient oral as well as scientific evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the present crime and, therefore, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the present bail application is liable to be dismissed. That the Jio SIM Card holding number 95184-45837 has been used by accused-petitioner in the aforesaid matter for the purpose of communication, is found to be registered in the name of Rajesh Kumar i.e., father of the accused-petitioner. That the details of call record/ CDRs are annexed herewith as Annexure R-7 for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.

**** **** ****

2. That the contents of para No.2 are incorrect and hence denied. The petitioner has not been falsely implicated. His complicity has emerged from the disclosure statements of the co-accused as well as his own disclosure statement, and is further corroborated by the independent statement of eye-witness Pradeep Singh, who specifically deposed that a call was received on the mobile of the deceased from a boy identifying himself as "Aman Pandit" luring him to the spot of occurrence."

8. As per the investigation conducted so far, the petitioner, who is duly named in the FIR, had lured the deceased to the place of occurrence by making a phone call to him, where he was murdered. The role played by the petitioner is pivotal to the entire occurrence. His case can be distinguished from that of his co-accused, namely Gurdas Singh

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

alias Mathu, Sahil @ Shanty and Amandeep alias Aman, who were granted bail as they were not named in the FIR, but came to be nominated as accused on the basis of the statement of one of the witnesses.

9. Further, the present petition is the 3rd bail petition and has been filed without any material change in circumstances.

10. Keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

11. However, the observations made hereinabove are only for the purposes of deciding this bail petition and the Trial Court is free to adjudicate upon the matter on the basis of the evidence led before it uninfluenced by any such observations made herein.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

10.09.2026
JITESH **Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No**
Whether reportable:- Yes/No

JITESH LAL
2026.09.11 14:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document