



CRM-M-23832-2025

1

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

227+228+237

(1) CRM-M-23832-2025

Aman

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

(2) CRM-M-25111-2025 (O&M)

Parveen @ Tapli

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

(3) CRM-M-34554-2025 (O&M)

Pawan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Date of Decision: 24.09.2025**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-23832-2025.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-25111-2025.

Mr. L.M.Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-34554-2025.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(Oral)

1. This order will dispose of above-mentioned three petitions, as all of them have arisen out of a common FIR.
2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present



petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.0124 dated 30.09.2023, under Sections 147, 148, 307 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25(1-B)(a)/27(1)(A) of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Sohna, District Gurugram.

3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Sanjay Raghav. It was alleged that on 30.09.2023 at around 3:18 pm, they were sitting in their house for condolence of death occurred in the family. In the meantime, 5 persons namely Parveen @ Tipli (petitioner in CRM-M-25111-2025), Sanjay Sharma, Pawan s/o Krishan, Prashant with other unknown persons came to their house and immediately upon arrival, they started firing and gave death threats. After firing, they escaped from the place. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits and FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioners surfaced and the petitioners were arrested. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide order dated 08.04.2025, 16.04.2025 and 07.06.2024, respectively. Pawan-Petitioner in CRM-M-34554-2025 has earlier approached this Court by way of filing the petition for grant of regular bail in CRM-M-42945-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 02.04.2025. Hence, the petitioners have approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present



case. It is submitted that the allegations made regarding the firing are totally baseless. Learned counsel for the petitioner, namely, Pawan in CRM-M-34554-2025 submits that petitioner was even not named in the FIR, however, during investigation he has been falsely arrayed as an accused. Also submitted that no specific role has been attributed against the petitioners. To buttress their arguments, they submitted that the alleged occurrence had taken place in the presence of the complainant. They further submit that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1 and he has not supported the case of the prosecution; rather, he has deposed before the trial Court that he did not see any person and the police had taken his signature on the blank papers. Hence, he has been declared hostile. They submit that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, however, there is no material progress in the trial. Thus, they have submitted that the petitioners deserve the concession of regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He submits that the complicity of the petitioners duly surfaced during investigation. He submits that the petitioners are habitual offender and involved in other cases as well. He submits that out of five, two of the accused have been granted bail and out of 36 prosecution witnesses, 3 already have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificates of the petitioners, namely, Pawan and Parveen @ Tapli.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest. FIR was registered on the statement of complainant who has been examined before the trial Court and has not supported the case of the prosecution and declared hostile. There is no denial to the fact that every accused has the

**CRM-M-23832-2025****4**

fundamental right of speedy trial. The aspect of custody, in itself, tilts the balance in favour of the petitioners for consideration of their prayer for grant of bail. Custody certificates of the petitioners would show that the petitioner-Parveen @ Tapli has suffered an incarceration of about 01 year 10 months and 03 days as on 23.09.2025 and he is involved in other cases, however, he is on bail in 08 cases and petitioner-Pawan has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 05 months and 27 days as on 23.09.2025 and is involved in 02 other cases, however, he is on bail in these cases.

7. 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 petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. It is being clarified that in case petitioner in CRM-M-25111-2025- Parveen @ Tapli and Aman-petitioner in CRM-M-23832-2025 do not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, their custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

24.09.2025

Rajeev (rvs)

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**