

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

245

CRM-M-18481-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 22.04.2025

SONU BALVIR UJANVAL

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Vipin Chaudhary, Advocate
Mr. Nitish Kumar Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG Haryana

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Status report dated 21.04.2025 filed in the form of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, HQ, Faridabad, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Arguments heard.
3. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-2) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
46	15.02.2025	25(1-B)(a) of the Arms Act	Sector 8, Faridabad

4. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR but has been allegedly



nominated on the disclosure statement of co-accused Krishna @ Nanu, with whom the petitioner has no concern of any transaction. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has assailed these arguments by arguing that the petitioner is actively involved in the crime and the accused Krishna @ Nanu, who has been apprehended by the Police with one country-made pistol and one live cartridge had categorically disclosed to have purchased the same from the petitioner. He contends that being the supplier of the illicit weapon and cartridge, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the source from where the illegal weapons are brought to create lawlessness in the State. Hence, prays for dismissal of the bail petition.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that on the basis of a secret information, the police party had apprehended co-accused Krishna @ Nanu and from his possession one country-made pistol along with one live cartridge was recovered, which was taken into police possession. During the course of his interrogation, the said accused made a disclosure statement claiming to have purchased those weapon from the petitioner.

7. Although the petitioner is not named in the FIR, but his name surfaced during interrogation of co-accused Krishna @ Nanu, who in his disclosure statement (Annexure R-1) had specifically stated to have purchased the country-made pistol and cartridge from the present petitioner



for ₹20,000/-. The petitioner is having other criminal cases, so his involvement in the big racket supplying the illicit weapons in the area cannot be ruled out and for this reason his custodial interrogation is certainly required to unearth the source wherefrom such illegal weapons are procured and supplied to the people to create lawlessness in the State.

8. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

9. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

22.04.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No