



CRM-M-15854-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-15854-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.07.2025

Praveen @ Kalu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**CRM-11934-2025**

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.276 dated 19.11.2019 under Sections 341, 506, 307, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Tigaon, Faridabad.

2. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the FIR in the present case was lodged by the complainant, namely, Avatar. He submits that as per the allegations made by the complainant, Naresh etc. shot his brother, Sunder on his foot. He submits that the petitioner was arrayed as an accused during the investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He submits that the petitioner was initially arrested on 06.12.2019 and this Court vide order dated 14.07.2020 had enlarged him on regular bail. He submits that thereafter, the petitioner was regularly appearing before the trial Court, but



due to some unavoidable circumstances, he failed to appear before the trial Court only on one date i.e. 31.08.2023, due to which his bail was cancelled and he was re-arrested on 26.04.2024. He further submits that since then he is behind the bars. He submits that all the co-accused are already on bail. He submits that the prosecution has not been able to conclude the trial till date. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner has misused the concession of bail granted by this Court and hence, his bail was rightly cancelled and thereafter, he was arrested on 26.04.2024. However, he affirms that rest of the accused are on bail. On instructions from ASI Hemraj, he has submitted that out of total 17 prosecutions witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined. He has also filed reply by way of affidavit of Ashok Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Tigaon Faridabad.

4. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that initially the petitioner was arrested on 06.12.2019 and he was granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 14.07.2020. However, as he failed to appear before the trial Court, his bail was cancelled and thereafter, he was arrested on 26.04.2024 and since then he is behind the bars. As submitted before this Court, rest of the accused are already on bail. Out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined.

5. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the



conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

31.07.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No