



214

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15686-2026
Decided on : 08.07.2026

Farman

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ashish Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Garg, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Farman	46	04.03.2025	S. 109(1), 132, 221 of BNS, 2023 (erstwhile S. 109, 353 & 186 of IPC) and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Sector 20	Panchkula

2. A gist of allegations, as summed up by the trial Court, is reproduced here-under:-

“ Brief facts for disposal of this application for bail are that on 04.03.2025, SI Ravi Kumar along with his team was present in Industrial Area, Phase-I, Panchkula, in connection with patrolling duty and detection of crime. At about 8.00 PM, a secret information was received that Happy, a leader of snatching gang will come by a motor-cycle of black colour make Splendor from Dhakoli (Punjab) side to commit a crime at Village Kundi, Sector-20, Panchkula and if baricades are installed



near crematorium, he can be apprehended. Believing the information to be correct, barricades were installed near the cremation ground at Village Kundi, Sector-20, Panchkula. At about 8.45 PM, a boy was seen coming from Dhakoli (Punjab) side and upon seeing the police barricades ahead, he immediately turned towards Dhakoli. He was warned on a speaker to stop but he suddenly fired a shot at police team with intention to kill them which hit the government vehicle on driver side. Then, SI Ravi Kumar immediately informed the police control room through the wireless set. In the meantime, the accused turned back and again fired at police party. However, in panic, he fell down from his motor-cycle. Then SI Ravi Kumar immediately fired at the feet of the accused from his service pistol to protect himself and his fellow employees. SI Ravi Kumar again fired a shot in his self-defence and the bullet hit the left leg of the accused. Resultantly, after having injured he fell down on the ground. Immediately thereafter, ASI Ravinder Pal and ASI Karamjit Singh, members of the police party overpowered the accused alongwith pistol and SI Ravi Kumar snatched the pistol from the right hand of the accused. Upon inquiry, accused disclosed his name as Happy son of Ravinder Pal, resident of near Sarpanch's Flour Mill, Mauli Jagran, Chandigarh. The accused was immediately shifted to Civil Hospital, Sector-6, Panchkula for medical treatment. Post trap formalities were completed and a formal FIR under Sections 109(1), 132 and 221 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act, 1959 was registered against the accused.”

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argues that petitioner is neither named in FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him at the time of commission of crime. It is only after arrest of co-accused, and on basis of disclosure statement made by him, that petitioner came to be arrested and involved in present case without there being any incriminating evidence against him. Even at the time of his arrest, no weapon was recovered from possession of petitioner.

Further submits that petitioner is inside jail since 06.10.2025 and one pistol was recovered from co-accused Happy. Thus, in given facts



and circumstances, learned counsel for petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 06.07.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that beside present case, there are four other cases are registered against the petitioner., the details of which are as under:-

- (i) *FIR No.03 dated 02.01.2022 under section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.*
- (ii) *FIR No.133 dated 10.02.2024 under section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.*
- (iii) *FIR No.35 dated 29.01.2024 under sections 302, 201, 120-B, 34 of IPC, Police Station Sadar Yamuna "Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.*
- (iv) *FIR No.234 dated 01.12.2022 under sections 182, 211, 120-B, 201 of IPC and 25/67 of Arms Act Police Station Raipur Rani, District Panchkula. A*

Therefore, petitioner is not entitled for any concessional relief.

6. In response to submissions addressed by learned State counsel, learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in present case without there being any material to connect him with alleged occurrence. He further submits that petitioner is already on bail in all other pending criminal cases. It is also argued that petitioner is neither



named in FIR nor any recovery has been effected from him, and no specific role of firing any shot has been attributed to him. Thus, his implication in present case is wholly unwarranted.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

8. Issue regarding involvement of petitioner in present case is yet to be determined during course of trial. Cogent and substantive evidence would be required to establish allegations against petitioner. Keeping petitioner inside jail merely on basis of disclosure statement of co-accused is itself a debatable issue, as evidentiary value thereof is yet to be examined by trial Court in accordance with law.

Though petitioner is stated to be involved in four other criminal cases, however, as per learned counsel for petitioner he is already on bail in all those cases. Besides, petitioner has already remained inside jail for a period of about 09 months.

9. Therefore, without commenting upon merits of case, and keeping in view totality of facts and circumstances as noticed here-above, this Court deems it appropriate to extend concession of regular bail to petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any



threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. 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.

12. **Petition stands disposed of.**

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 08, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*