



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

210

CRM-M-34106-2024

Date of decision: 29.09.2025

Karan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Karan Verma, Advocate, with  
Mr. Teejas Bhatia, Advocate, for  
Ms. Nayan, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C., in case FIR No.62 dated 23.02.2019, under Sections 302, 201, 386, 34 IPC, 1960 and Sections 25, 27, 25(1-a) (a) of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gurugram.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the incident of firing gunshots at victim Vijay Batra occurred on 23.02.2019, wherein the main accused, namely Kaushal, was subsequently convicted after trial. The present petitioner was named in the FIR on account of his communication with the said Kaushal, and the allegation against him is that he played an active role in the commission of the crime. It is alleged that the petitioner had made arrangements for Kaushal's stay in Dubai and had facilitated the establishment of communication with his gang in India. It is further stated that the petitioner was arrested on 19.11.2023 upon his arrival in India.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as there is no direct evidence



against the present petitioner. He was named in the disclosure statement of the co-accused. The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 09 months and 29 days as an under trial. Out of total 89 cited prosecution witnesses, only 10 have been examined so far. Learned counsel further submits that continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 09 days and 29 days.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that out of 89 cited prosecution witnesses, only 10 have been examined, the 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.

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, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.09.2025**

anil

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No  
Whether reportable : Yes / No