



CRM-M-44274-2025

-1-

**244 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-44274-2025**

Date of Decision: 21.08.2025

Ravi @ Bhola

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Siddarth, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.68 dated 01.02.2020 under Sections 148, 149, 224, 225, 307, 333, 353, 120-B, 216 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dabua, Faridabad.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Umed Kumar. It was alleged that he was posted in Police Line Gurgaon and his duty was to produce accused in the Court. It was alleged that he along with police officials had gone to Bhondsi Jail for producing the accused from Police Line, Gurgaon to Faridabad. Accused were to be produced by them before Faridabad Court. It was further alleged that after producing the accused, at about 2:30 P.M., they were returning back to Bhondsi Jail and on the way, at about 3:10 p.m., when they reached near Hanuman Temple at Faridabad-Gurgaon Road, a Scorpio by overtaking, stopped in front of their vehicle. They saw one white coloured Swift Dezire car towards right side and one Ritz car at back side of the bus. 10-12 persons came from those vehicles and started firing on the bus, out of which one bullet hit on right shoulder of ASI Jitender. During the firing, Sandeep @ Kala tried to flee but was caught by



CRM-M-44274-2025

-2-

ASI Jitender from his neck. Leaving his shirt and sweater, he was able to flee away and one accused Dhan Singh @ Raju also fled away in Scorpio vehicle bearing registration No.HR-14R-4614. Out of these persons, one was identified as Narender @ Sathi, who was seen by him in the Court. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits in this case. After registration of the FIR, investigation commenced and during the investigation, complicity of the petitioner established. Thus, he was arrayed as an accused, however, he could be not arrested and was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 17.12.2020. However, during the investigation of another case FIR No.25 of 2020, the petitioner was arrested on 04.09.2021 in this case. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for the grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the same was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide order dated 08.04.2025. Hence the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Kaptan. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 01.04.2025 passed in **CRM-M-16507-2025**, whereby, co-accused Kaptan has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 04.09.2021. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail



CRM-M-44274-2025

-3-

to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Kaptan. She has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 04.09.2021. Co-accused, namely, Kaptan is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 03 years, 11 months & 16 days as on 20.08.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in fifteen more cases.

6. 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 petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

21.08.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No