



**CRA-S-2003-2025**

**-1-**

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

**203(iii)**

**CRA-S-2003-2025**

**Date of Decision: 01.09.2025**

**RAI SAHIB @ RAM SINGH LUHAR**

**... APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR**

**... RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 19.05.2025 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad vide which the regular bail of the appellant has been dismissed in FIR No. 272 dated 16.06.2024 under Sections 302,307,506,120-B,212, 34 IPC, 3 of SC/ST Act and Section 25 of Arms Act (added later on) registered at Police Station City Fatehabad District Fatehabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the appellant has supplied the illegal weapons to the co-accused in order facilitate them to murder Balraj @ Goli.

**CRA-S-2003-2025****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has not been named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him. No recovery has been effected from the appellant. He further submits that since the charge against the appellant is only under Arms Act for which he cannot be sentenced for more than three years. The appellant is in custody since 13.02.2025 and trial of the case may take quite some time, therefore, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the appellant in the custody any more.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the short reply by way of affidavit of Jagdish Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, Haryana and the same is taken on record. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposes the grant of regular bail to the appellant on the ground that the appellant has played an active role in the commission of offence. He further submits that out of 55 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the above submission of learned counsel and considering the custody period and the fact that trial is moving at a snail's pace as out of 55 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 witnesses have been examined so far, the continuous detention of the appellant would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, the rule is bail and rejection is exception. Hence, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the appellant during the pendency of the trial.



**CRA-S-2003-2025**

**-3-**

7. In view of the above impugned order dated 19.05.2025 passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad is hereby set aside and appellant is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**01.09.2025**

*renu*

**(H.S.GREWAL)  
JUDGE**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |