



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28645-2025

Reserved on: 7th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 12th August, 2025

Kartik

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Munish Behl, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 54 dated 01.03.2025 registered under Sections 109(1), 190, 191(3), 238, 249 and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25(1) (B) (a) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. As per the allegations, on 01.03.2025, on receipt of an information from the security incharge of Court premises, Ambala regarding a firing incident having taken place in the Court complex, a police party reached at the spot and recorded statement of Aman Kumar Sonkar son of Vikram Kumar alleging therein that he was having inimical relations with accused Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond son of Khoob Chand, since the year 2018. The said Aman Bond was a habitual offender against whom several criminal cases were registered. In the year 2022, Aman Bond along with his accomplices had used fire arms outside his house with intent to kill him and



a case under Section 307 of IPC was registered in this regard. He alleged that on 21.02.2025, he had visited that Court complex for some purpose. The accused Aman Bond reached there along with his accomplices and had extended threat to kill him if he made any deposition in the case registered against him. Then on 01.03.2025, also the complainant along with his companions Raman and Sachin Verma had reached at the Court complex for the purpose of attending hearing of a criminal case when the accused Aman Bond accompanied by his brother, Shubham @ Kaka, Gaurav and one unknown person reached there in a black Scorpio car bearing registration No. HR 80 5J7070. On seeing him, all of them alighted and opened an attack upon the complainant. He rushed inside the gate of the Court complex to save himself. Then one youth who was with Aman Bond handed over a pistol to him and Aman Bond fired 2-3 round with the fire arm with intent to kill but he had somehow escaped. He also disclosed that the driver of the Scorpio vehicle had stayed inside the vehicle at the time of incident. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded. CCTV footage of the camera of Bar Association Ambala was also taken in pen drive. The accused Amit @ Nepali was apprehended on 09.03.2025. He was arrested and suffered disclosure statement on interrogation, on the basis of which accused Aditya @ Saurabh was arrested. The petitioner and co-accused Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond were arrested on the basis of secret information on 10.03.2025. On interrogation, they suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. Offences under Sections 61(2) and 111(3) of BNS were added. Accused Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond suffered second disclosure statement on 14.03.2025, saying that



the pistol used by him in the crime was received from the present petitioner. He also got recovered the said pistol. Investigation qua the petitioner and co-accused Amit, Aditya and Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond, has completed. Challan stands presented in the Court.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. Nor any specific role has been attributed to him by the complainant. He was nominated as accused on the basis of disclosure statements of co-accused Amit and Aditya which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. The story that he had given pistol to Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond is totally false. He is also not shown in the CCTV footage as collected during investigation. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object thereof is alleged to have gone outside the premises of district Court, Ambala on 01.03.2025 and is alleged to have opened an assault upon the complainant Aman Sonkar and his companions. The petitioner, being a member of that unlawful assembly,



had handed over pistol to the co-accused Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond and then accused Aman Sonkar @ Aman Bond had fired shots on the victim thereby making an attempt to kill him. The respondent-State has placed on record a pen drive containing CCTV footage from the camera installed in the Court premises which shows the petitioner while handing over a fire arm to the co-accused and while accompanying the co-accused. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. In broad daylight, he along with the co-accused, went outside the Court premises with intent to commit murder of the victim and such attempt had been made by firing shots upon the victim by the co-accused. Being a member of the unlawful assembly, the petitioner is *prima facie* presumed to be having vicarious liability for commission of the subject offences. The victim is yet to be examined. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The apprehension that he may intimidate the witnesses, cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

12th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*