



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-45666-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.08.2025

Ankush

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Suresh Kumar Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.173 dated 17.07.2023 under Sections 147, 149, 307, 323, 452, 506 of IPC and 25(1)(b) of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station DLF Phase-1, Gurugram.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 26.08.2025 has been filed today in the Court by the learned State counsel and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. It is evident from a perusal of the status report that the petitioner is a person of continued criminal antecedents with involvement in two cases under Section 307 as well as offence under 302 of IPC. Further, it is apparent that he has been declared as proclaimed offender in one of the cases i.e. FIR No.180 dated 08.09.2021 registered at Police Station Sector-65, Gurugram under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 325 and 506 IPC, while he



209

CRM-M-45666-2025 (O&M)

has not been appearing in two other FIRs viz. FIR No.214 dated 01.08.2023 registered under Sections 148, 149, 153, 186, 302, 307, 323, 353, 427 and 436 of IPC at Police Station Sector-56, Gurugram and FIR No.147 dated 03.06.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 308(3), 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station DLF Phase-1, Gurugram. Further, it is also reflected that the CCTV footage clearly showed the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence. The crime scene having been investigated, the live cartridges alongwith live and empty bullet recovered and taken into possession and the incriminating evidence being available which reflects the participation of the petitioner, I do not deem it as a fit case to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. At this juncture, counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner shall surrender within a period of one week and contends that he would be satisfied, in case, the trial Court is directed to decide the bail application of the petitioner expeditiously.

5. Learned State counsel does not oppose the same.

6. In the event of the petitioner surrendering before the trial Court within a period of one week from today, his application for regular bail be decided within a period of three days of submission of such application.

7. **Disposed of.**

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.08.2025

Mangal Singh

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