



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-55204-2024

Date of decision: February 19th, 2025

Sachin @ Sultan

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Yogesh Vashista, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under in FIR No.352 dated 17.10.2024 under Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, and Section 109(1) of the BNS, registered at Police Station IMT, District Rohtak.

2. Vide order dated 07.11.2024, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that a twisted version has been brought forth in the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, that on the fateful day, the petitioner armed with a pistol aimed towards the complainant. Learned counsel submits that a perusal of the FIR itself reveals that it was the complainant, who on seeing the petitioner armed with a pistol, grabbed his hand, as a result of which the trigger of the pistol went off of injuring not the complainant but the petitioner himself.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 06.02.2025, the petitioner has joined

investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency and hence, the order dated 07.11.2024 be made absolute.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, has not disputed the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation in compliance of order dated 06.02.2025, however, it has been asserted that the petitioner has not cooperated with the investigating agency as the pistol, which was allegedly used in the crime in question has not yet been recovered.

5. Counsel for the petitioner has reiterated that it is a case of false implication and even otherwise, it is a matter of record that it is the petitioner, who had suffered injuries at the hands of the complainant party; furthermore, the alleged weapon used was purportedly a countrymade weapon, which even did not belong to the petitioner.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 07.11.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

February 19th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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