



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

239

CRM-M-65400-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.03.2025

Ajruddin @ Azharuddin

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Khalid Tauru, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner in the instant (second) petition is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.225 dated 22.05.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 285, 307, 506, 212 of the IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Tauru, District Nuh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.11.2023 and even though the charges were framed way back on 05.09.2024 none of the 31 prosecution witnesses cited have been examined till date. It has been further contended that even otherwise no injury, much less any specific role, has been attributed to the petitioner; co-accused Sumer who had been attributed a firearm injury has since been extended the concession of bail as it was found that the empties recovered from the spot did not



CRM-M-65400-2024 (O&M)

match with the weapon of offence allegedly recovered from co-accused Sumer. Learned counsel submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner be extended the concession of bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has he disputed on instructions the stage of trial. Learned State counsel, on further instructions, has also not disputed that no injury, much less with a firearm, has been attributed to the petitioner in the occurrence in question, and furthermore, co-accused Sumer has already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 04.12.2024.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 03.11.2023. The petitioner has not been attributed any specific role or injury in the occurrence in question. Since none of the 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial would take considerable time to conclude. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the



CRM-M-65400-2024 (O&M)

concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

18.03.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

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