

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

**CRM-M-17759-2023  
DECIDED ON: 21.04.2023**

**ANANT KUMAR**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Ms. Navneet Kaur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

1. This is a petition seeking regular bail in FIR No.443, dated 09.11.2022, under Sections 25(1-B)(a) and 27(1) of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 307, 34 and 398 of Indian Penal Code, 1860( Section 120-B of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station DLF Gurugram, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not initially named in the FIR and roped in on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He further submits that the role of the petitioner is only that he was the informer of co-accused Vinay Kumar, who has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court in CRM-M-14369-2023.

3. Learned State counsel does not controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner stating that Mahender Singh Negi

collected the cash. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars for the last 4 months and 27 days and is not involved in other case.

4. Considering the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and it is an admitted case of the State that Mahender Singh Negi has collected the cash added with the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case added with the aspect that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

5. The present petition is, hereby, allowed.

6. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.04.2023

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)  
JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |