

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CNR No:PHHC010938122026
2026:PHHC:104491



CRM-M-32145-2026 (O&M)

Karambir @ Karmu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	28.07.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	30.07.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	30.07.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the 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. S.S. Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Punam Singh, Advocate,
Ms. Rashi Sehrawat,, Advocate and
Mr. Bhanu Udai, Advocate for the complainant.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.119, dated 25.02.2022, registered under Sections 148, 149, 302, 201 and 120-B IPC, at Police

Station Pataudi, District Gurugram.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by complainant – Ajit Singh, alleging therein that in the morning of 25.02.2022, he along with his brother Paramjit Singh and other family members was present outside the house of Dharambir Lumberdar when accused Ajay @ Jaildar along with 4-5 unknown persons and co-accused reached there in a Scorpio vehicle and a motorbike. They were armed with weapons. They at once started firing shots with the firearms on the person of his brother Paramjit Singh. Accused Ajay @ Jaildar along with other co-accused then proclaimed that elder brother of the complainant should also be killed. On hearing so, the complainant rushed towards his house and saw accused Sandeep Goriyawas, Dinesh, Rohit accompanied by some other persons while firing shots on his brother Sujit Singh. Clamour was raised by his father and aunt. On hearing so, several persons reached at the spot and then the assailants fled away. The injured Paramjit Singh and Sujit Singh were taken to the hospital but were declared to be brought dead. By alleging that the occurrence was committed at the behest of Dhanpat, his nephew Jassu and his sons, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post mortem examination of the dead bodies of the victims was conducted. CCTV footages of the cameras installed in the vicinity of the occurrence were obtained. During investigation, accused Akshay was arrested. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the conspiracy hatched with the co-accused for committing

murder of victims Paramjit Singh and Sujit Singh. During the further investigation, the petitioner was nominated as an accused and was arrested on 15.03.2022. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered the Scorpio vehicle bearing registration No.HR-76-D-1227 used by him for absconding from the crime scene along with one dongle and one mobile phone. Subsequently, some other accused were also arrested. Investigation qua him stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he was not named in the FIR. No specific act has been attributed to him. He was not even present at the spot. He was not nominated by other accused. There is no direct evidence forthcoming on record to connect him with the commission of subject offences. No firearm or any other weapon has been recovered from him. He was also not alleged to be amongst the shooters. He is in custody since 15.03.2022. The chances of conclusion of trial in near future are bleak as only 38 out of 91 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. Co-accused Mohit @ Babu Maan, Vishnu @ Ghochu, Ravi @ Pehalwan and Ajay @ Ajju have also been extended benefit of bail. The case of the petitioner is on parity with them. Only on account of his involvement in 02 other cases, he cannot be denied benefit of bail. His prolonged incarceration militates against his fundamental rights enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel

for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature as he was an active member of the gang of Lawrence Bishnoi and had conspired with co-accused Ajay @ Jaildar and Naresh Sethi with whom he had remained in regular contact through encrypted communication platforms, namely, Signal App and WhatsApp by using internet dongles and mobile phones. His complicity in the crime stands established from the material collected during the course of investigation. He had provided shelter to principal accused persons after commission of offence of the murder of victims and was a harbourer. He had also provided weapons used by the assailants and had assisted the offenders in screening themselves from legal punishment by causing disappearance of evidence of the offence. He is a member of Lawrence Bishnoi gang. There are chances of his committing similar offences, intimidating the witnesses or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged 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. The role attributed to the petitioner is of facilitating illegal procurement of firearms from one Satendra @ Goldy Brar at Rishikesh, about taking the co-accused to a *kothra* of co-accused Ajay in the fields of village Goriyawas and about facilitating the safe escape of the assailants after committing the murder of the victims. The linkage sought to be established between the petitioner and the supply of firearms and harbouring the co-accused primarily rests on disclosure statement of co-accused and circumstantial inference. The role attributed to him is that of a

conduit or facilitator in the purported procurement of arms and of harbouring the co-accused which is distinct and remote offence from the direct commission of offence punishable under Section 302 of IPC. This Court is conscious that this is the case of murder of two persons and the offences are serious. However, this Court is required to test whether the material against the petitioner justifies his continued pre-trial incarceration. Since the case against him rests upon disclosure statement of the co-accused, this is the matter best left with the trial Court to decide on the basis of thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial. The petitioner is in custody for a period of about 04 years and 04 months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as only 38 out of 91 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. As such, further pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. In view of the foregoing discussion, particularly the limited role as ascribed 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 and subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each date of hearing unless exempted.
- (ii) He shall not tamper with evidence or attempt to influence witnesses in any manner.

(iii) He shall surrender his passport, if any, furnish details of his cell phone and Aadhar card, and shall not change his mobile number(s) during the pendency of the trial.

(iv) He shall visit the Police Station concerned on the first Monday of every alternative month during the trial of the case and will mark his presence before SHO. In case of non-appearance, the SHO concerned shall intimate the trial Court.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

30.07.2026

harjeet

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No