



CRM-M-44522-2025

- 1 -

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

229

CRM-M-44522-2025

Decided on : 27.11.2025

Shahid @ Polo

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sarfaraj Anjum Mor, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Varun Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.34, dated 03.02.2025, under Sections 312, 313 of BNS, 2023 & 25(1-B) a, 54-59 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at P.S. Sadar Tauru, District Nuh Mewat, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, on 03.02.2025, at about 8:00 PM, when the police party was on patrol duty in a Government vehicle bearing registration No. HR27-GV-5177, and on reaching KMP Road ahead of KMP Tawadu Dhulawat Toll at around 8:48 PM, they were intercepted by three armed persons. One was carrying a country-made pistol, another an iron rod, and the third a wooden stick. The accused armed with the pistol pointed the weapon at the neck of the ASI, the one holding the iron rod placed it at the neck of the driver, and the third raised a threat, demanding to hand over whatever they had with them. However, the police managed to



CRM-M-44522-2025

- 2 -

maneuver the situation by diverting the vehicle, and all three accused were apprehended on the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that two of the co-accused, namely Aamir @ Anna, has been granted bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Nuh vide order dated 05.03.2025 (Annexure P-3), and similarly, another co-accused Imran @ Haidra was also granted bail vide order dated 27.03.2025 (Annexure P-4). Therefore, on the ground of parity, the petitioner also deserves the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned counsel further contends that although several other FIRs have been registered against the petitioner, yet he has not been convicted in any one of them. It is submitted that merely because the petitioner's name appears in multiple cases, without any conviction, his right to personal liberty cannot be curtailed indefinitely or treated adversely at the stage of consideration of bail. It is argued that the petitioner was already known to the police and has been falsely implicated repeatedly, therefore, he deserves the benefit of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate dated 25.11.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at an appropriate place. A copy thereof has been supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel, while referring to the custody certificate, submits that although the petitioner is shown to be involved in multiple other criminal cases, he has not been held guilty in any one of them till date. He further confirms that both co-accused have already been granted regular bail



CRM-M-44522-2025

- 3 -

and the petitioner has been in custody for about 09 months. It is also admitted that out of a total of 11 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. In these circumstances, he submits that the opposition to bail is primarily on account of the petitioner's antecedents, though he concedes that those cases have not resulted in conviction.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds that the petitioner has already undergone substantial custody, the trial has not commenced as not even a single prosecution witness has been examined, and both his co-accused have already been granted bail.

According to the view of this Court, allegations are yet to be proved, as to who else than the police officials have supported the case of prosecution. Besides, petitioner is also not shown to have misused bail in any previous case nor is there any material to show that he attempted to threaten witnesses or tamper with evidence. Continued incarceration of the petitioner, in such circumstances where the trial is likely to take considerable time, would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



CRM-M-44522-2025

- 4 -

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

9. 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.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 27, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*