



CRM-M-47581-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

343

CRM-M-47581-2025
Decided on : 20.11.2025

RAVI @ BHOLA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ravi @ Bhola, aged about 27 years	25	01.02.2020	186, 201, 332, 353, 307, 34 of IPC and section 25 of Arms Act	Dhauj	Faridabad

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the case of prosecution, on 01.02.2020, police received information that certain individuals had attacked a prison van by firing at it and had succeeded in securing the escape of some prisoners. Upon receiving this information, a *nakabandi* was set up at Sikrona Chowk. After some time,



a Scorpio vehicle was seen approaching the barricade, and despite being signalled to stop, its driver did not comply. Police party then chased the said vehicle and was compelled to open fire. Out of the five occupants, three persons, namely Dhan Singh @ Kaju, Kapil @ Ninni, and Naresh @ Sethi, sustained injuries and were apprehended at the spot, while two others managed to flee. After arrest of these three accused persons, another accused namely Ravi @ Bhola (petitioner herein), along with his co-accused Sandeep @ Kala, were implicated in the present case.

3. Primary contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is in custody for a period of more than 3 years and 11 months, despite no weapon having been recovered from him. His continued detention is primarily due to the fact that several other cases are registered against him.

4. It is further argued that co-accused Dhan Singh @ Kaju and Kapil @ Ninni, who also face multiple criminal cases, have already been extended the concession of bail.

In this regard, counsel refers to the order dated 15.03.2022 granting bail to Kapil @ Ninni by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, as well as the order dated 06.12.2021 granting bail to co-accused Dhan Singh @ Kaju by the same Court.

5. On the strength of these circumstances, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 01.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag



the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 03 years 11 months and 27 days period inside jail.

7. Learned State counsel has also filed status report dated 18.11.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

8. Learned State counsel, while referring to paragraph No.5 of the status report, submits that petitioner is involved in seven other criminal cases and, being a habitual offender, is not entitled to the concession of bail in the present matter.

9. Status report further indicates, in paragraph Nos.6 and 7, that co-accused Kapil @ Ninni is involved in total 12 cases, while another co-accused, Dhan Singh @ Kaju, is involved in total 5 cases. On these grounds, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

10. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

11. Other cases registered against the petitioner, as mentioned in paragraph No.5 of the status report, are reproduced here under:-

“i. FIR No. 362/2019 u/s 384, 506, 120-B IPC, PS City Jhajjar. Acquitted vide order dated 31.01.2024.

ii. FIR No. 379/2021 u/s 174-A IPC, PS Dabua. Convicted vide order dated 22.02.2024.

iii. FIR No. 68/2020 u/s 148, 149, 224, 225, 307, 333, 353, 201 IPC and 25 of Arms Act, PS Dabua. Pending for prosecution evidence on 03.12.2025. Bail.

iv. FIR No. 69/2020 u/s 307, 395 IPC, PS Dabua, Faridabad. Pending for prosecution evidence on 03.12.2025. Bail.



v. *FIR No. 270/2020 u/s 302 IPC, PS City Jhajjar. Pending for prosecution evidence on 18.11.2025. Custody.*

vi. *FIR No. 37/2021 u/s 174-A IPC, PS Dabua. Convicted vide order dated 22.02.2024.*

vii. *FIR No. 275/2022 u/s 323, 506 and 34 IPC, PS Jhajjar.”*

12. It is noticed by this Court that out of the aforementioned seven cases registered against the petitioner, he has already been convicted in two cases, as mentioned at serial numbers (ii) and (vi), and has been acquitted in one case, as mentioned at serial number (i). In all the remaining cases, trial is still in progress and final outcome is yet to be determined.

It is further observed that other two co-accused, namely Kapil @ Ninni and Dhan Singh @ Kaju, are facing 12 and 05 criminal cases, respectively. In these circumstances, it will be upon the trial court to determine whether the prosecution's stand of implicating the petitioner solely on the basis of disclosure statement is sustainable in law, after the evidence is fully led.

Moreover, out of total 32 witnesses, only 09 have been examined so far, despite the fact that petitioner has remained in custody for a period of more than three years and eleven months. Therefore, liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period.

13. In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations, and the factors discussed above, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.



CRM-M-47581-2025

5

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.

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

15. 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.

16. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.11.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**