



CRM-M-17490-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-17490-2025

Date of Decision: 04.04.2025

Rahul @ Rahul Bhandari

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.30 dated 14.08.2024, under Sections 25(6), 25(7) of Arms Act registered at Police Station Punjab State Crime SAS Nagar, District Crime Wing, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the Police received a secret information regarding the involvement of Sunil @ Nata S/o Joginder Singh, Rahul Bhandari S/o Mahinder Bhatia (petitioner), Varinder Singh S/o Sona Singh, Karan S/o Ashok Kumar, Amandeep Singh @ Romi, Gurcharan Singh in smuggling of illegal weapons. On receiving the information, the case was registered and police constituted a raiding team. On lying the barricade, the disclosed two vehicles i.e. Innova Crysta and XUV 700, were stopped by the Investigating agency and the inmates of the same were nabbed. On asking, they disclosed their names as in the secret information. On conducting their personal search, weapons, revolvers and cartridges were recovered. They failed to produce any license regarding possession of the same and hence the FIR was registered and the petitioners were arrested on the spot. On registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. On



completion of investigation, challan was presented. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, District Mohali praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides learned trial Court vide its order dated 19.03.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing of present petition, praying for grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Varinder, Amandeep Singh @ Romy and Karan. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the common order dated 20.03.2025 passed in **CRM-M-59657-2024**, whereby, co-accused Varinder, Amandeep Singh @ Romy and Karan have been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is at par with the said co-accused. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Varinder, Amandeep Singh @ Romy and Karan. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 14.08.2024. Co-accused, namely, Varinder, Amandeep Singh @ Romy and Karan are on

bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has completed incarceration of 07 months and 17 days as on 03.04.2025.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, 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 on the basis of parity. 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.

04.04.2025		(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila		JUDGE
	Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable :	Yes/No