



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-28759-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 26.08.2025

SONU RAM . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Priya Sahoo, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (for short ‘BNSS’) (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.),
for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has
been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed
here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s))	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sonu Ram	222	11.04.2025	Section 25 of Arms Act & Sections 109(1), 121(1), 132, 221 of BNS, 2023	Shahabad Tehsil	Kurukshetra, Haryana

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that on getting secret
information, police party prosecuted two such suspects while they were 500
meters away from Hotel Neelkanth towards Sharifgarh. Two individuals were
noticed on a motorcycle. One of the accused had opened fire shots towards the
police and thereafter, in self-defence, police team has also retaliated by using the
service pistol. One of the accused was chased and then apprehended by members
of the police team and the other one, namely, Sonu Ram, who is the present



petitioner had suffered a gunshot injury and was, thus, arrested from the spot. Counsel further contends that in fact, a fake encounter has been projected by the prosecution, whereas petitioner who was never involved earlier in any other case, is shown to be involved in one more case, the incident of which, happened two days earlier to the arrest of the petitioner and on the basis of disclosure statement, after being arrested in the present case, he was nominated in other case bearing FIR No.89 dated 11.04.2025 at Police Station Civil Line Kaithal, Haryana.

Thus, submits that the story framed against the petitioner is to justify the shot which has been fired by members of the police team injuring the petitioner whereas there was no such involvement of the petitioner in any criminal activity. Petitioner is stated to be inside jail since 11.04.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has already been submitted. Petitioner being young boy of 22 years' of age deserves to be released by granting concession of bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel argues that petitioner is a habitual offender as he is found to be involved in two more cases of similar nature. However, he is unable to controvert the explanation given by the petitioner's counsel that in fact petitioner's name has been involved in the other case (referred as hereinabove) after being arrested in the present case in the injured condition. It is also admitted position that none of the members of the police team who had proceeded to arrest the petitioner and his other accomplice has suffered any injury by bullet or any other means.

4. Heard.

5. After hearing the respective counsel and going through the record available, I find that involvement of the petitioner in other case (referred as hereinabove) is actually there or not, is also an issue and yet to be decided independently whereas in the present case, he himself sustained injury because of



a shot fired by the police team. Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that personal liberty of the petitioner should not be curtailed for an indefinite period.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 26, 2025

Deepak Patwal

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*