

228

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-29259-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 10.03.2025

PARVEEN ALIAS JOKAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 CrPC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
202	23.07.2023	307, 34, 120-B IPC; 25 of the Arms Act	Uchana, District Jind

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that no specific overt act is attributed to the petitioner and he is in custody since 19.09.2023. He submits that the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time, thus, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status



CRM-M-29259-2024 (O&M) -2-

report filed by the State has assailed these arguments by submitting that there are specific attribution to the petitioner of having fired from his pistol on the complainant with intent to kill him and the weapon used by him had fallen at the spot on account of brick being thrown by the complainant party. He submits that as per the allegations, the petitioner had fired two rounds from his country-made pistol, the empties of which were recovered from the spot, as such, prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. As per the case of prosecution the instant FIR was registered against the petitioner and other unknown person having fired upon injured Sahil. It was alleged that .32 bore pistol being used by the petitioner had fallen on the ground during the occurrence while running away from the spot. The same was taken in possession by the Police. During the spot inspection, the police recovered one cartridge capsule 315 bore lying in the chaupal, one cartridge capsule 32 bore lying outside the chaupal in the drain, two empty cartridges of 315 bore lying at a distance and one 315 bore cartridge capsule were taken into possession.

6. A perusal of the record would reveal that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, as the person who had fired from his pistol upon the complainant with intent to kill him. As per the prosecution version on the brick being thrown towards the petitioner, his weapon fell down on the ground, which was later recovered by the police along with empty cartridges.

7. In these circumstances, considering the specific attribution to

the petitioner of having fired with the pistol upon the complainant with intent to kill him, he is not entitled to the concession of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

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

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

10.03.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

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