



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(213)

CRM-M-60268-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 29.11.2025

Parth Parashar

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Manoj Kaushik, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate, for complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.173 dated 08.08.2025, under Sections 109(1), 115(2), 190, 191(3), 324(5), 351(3) of BNS 2023 and under Section 25 of Arms Act 1959 and under Section 16/177 of Motor Vehicle Act (added lateron), registered at Police Station Sector 17, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that it is a version and cross version case and on the statement of co-accused Sunny, FIR bearing No.174 has been registered against the complainant of the present FIR i.e Pankaj. The allegations against the present petitioner is that he along with main accused Sunny, allegedly fired upon complainant. He further contended that co-accused Sunny also received greivous injuries in this incident but no injury was received by the present petitioner in this occurrence and no specific role is attributed to him.

3. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner has already been interrogated in this case and no source of gun has been traced out



belongs to the complainant who produced the same to the police and prayed that the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant contended that the present petitioner actively participated in the commission of offence. He was present at the time of occurrence and his co-accused fired gun shot from the illegal weapon which is supplied / provided by the present petitioner. He further submitted that the present petitioner is also involved in one case of similar nature and prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. Learned State counsel submitted that there are ten accused persons, who are yet to be arrested in this case and release of the present petitioner, at this stage, will hamper the investigation.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the manner in which the offence has been committed; how they fired negligently endangering the life of innocent people from illegal weapon and the allegation against present petitioner is that he supplied the weapon to co-accused which is used in commission of offence; investigation is going on and some of accused are yet to be arrested, so, at this stage, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

29.11.2025
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE