



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

CRM-M-57138-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 13.11.2025

Parveen @Sonu Jat

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Suresh Kumar Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 186, 307, 332, 353, and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of the Arms Act, the FIR No.631 dated 07.07.2023 has been lodged in Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat. The petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of abovementioned offence and he has been arrested. The petitioner is in custody, and therefore, craving for bail. This is third petition, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of Inspector Virender Singh, who stated that on 07.07.2023, when he was heading a police party and discharging his duty at Rohtak bypass road, he got a tip-off from an informant that two young boys armed with weapons were travelling in a car,

**CRM-M-57138-2025 (O&M)**

2

make Baleno, colour grey, and that they were roaming on Samalkha to Narayan Road with an intention to commit some crime. It was stated by the above-named police officer that relying upon the abovementioned information, when he reached the spot, his team spotted a Baleno car and they intercepted the same. The person, sitting on co-driver seat, alighted from the abovementioned car, who was armed with firearm, and started firing upon the police officials. As per above-named Inspector, the driver of the abovementioned car, who, too, was carrying a firearm, alighted from the car and fired a gunshot, and thereafter entered in the roadside fields. As per above-named Inspector, in the exercise of their right to defend themselves, police team also returned the fire upon the assailants, and in the abovementioned incident, one assailant died on the spot, and another one was suffered injuries, who was apprehended and shifted to hospital.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State, and waives service. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is facing protracted trial for being in custody for a period of more than 02 years and 03 months, and that the trial is progressing at a snail pace, as even after such a long incarceration, not even a single witness has been completely examined. It has also been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had moved an application under Section 309 of



CrPC for expeditious disposal of trial, but the abovementioned application has been dismissed, and thus, new ground has arisen for filing the petition for bail.

7. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has argued that earlier petition moved by the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn recently, i.e. on 22.08.2025, and that from the date of dismissal of second bail petition, there is no significant change in circumstances. The learned State Counsel has pointed out that complete statement of one witness and examination-in-chief of two witnesses have already been examined, and that the petitioner has a long criminal history, as he is facing prosecution in seven other cases.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that this is third petition for bail moved by the petitioner. The record also shows that the second petition for bail was dismissed after hearing arguments at length, and that, too, on 22.08.2025. From the date of dismissal of second petition, there is no significant change in the trial. As far as the ground, pleaded by learned counsel for the petitioner, that the application under Section 309 CrPC has been dismissed, is concerned, it is hereby held that the abovementioned ground is not sufficient to maintain the third bail petition. Rather the remedy available to the petitioner is to challenge the order, whereby the abovementioned application has been dismissed.

10. Since from the date of dismissal of second petition, no significant change in circumstances has taken place, it is hereby held that the present petition for bail is devoid of merit, and deserves dismissal.

11. In view of above, the present petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 13, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No