



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

**CRM-M No.7055 of 2026
Date of decision: 12.05.2026**

Ranjit @ Gaurav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Punit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Present is the second petition under Section 483 B.N.S.S. (439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.180 dated 25.06.2025, registered under Sections 310(4), 111(2)(B), 310(5), 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Manesar, Gurugram, Haryana.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 24.06.2025, a secret information was received by the police officials of Crime Branch, Manesar to the effect that one Kaushal along with his associates namely Varun @ Anmol, Ombir @ Golu, Anil @ Monu, Archit @ Dheeraj and Ranjeet @ Gaurav were planning to commit the offence of looting trucks on the National Highway and were also possessing illegal weapons. Acting upon the said information, raiding teams were constituted and initially, accused



Anil and Varun @ Anmol were apprehended, who disclosed the whereabouts of the present petitioner and other co-accused. Thereafter, the present petitioner Ranjeet @ Gaurav along with co-accused Archit @ Dheeraj was apprehended from village Heraheri. During further investigation, the accused allegedly disclosed about the presence of other co-accused persons possessing illegal weapons in a room situated near Pachgaon Chowk to Kasan road. Subsequently, another raid was conducted where firing allegedly took place from the side of the accused persons upon the police party and in retaliation, one accused namely Kaushal sustained firearm injury and was apprehended along with another co-accused Ombir. Thereafter, formal FIR was registered, investigation was conducted and challan has already been presented before the trial Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the present petitioner are limited only to the extent that he was allegedly present with the main accused at the time of planning of the alleged offence and no specific overt act has been attributed to him. It has been submitted that the petitioner was neither arrested from the spot nor any weapon has been recovered from his conscious possession. Learned counsel further submits that the allegations regarding opening fire upon the police party are specifically against the main accused namely Kaushal and the present petitioner has merely been implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Anil and Varun @ Anmol, which is inadmissible in evidence in the absence of any recovery effected pursuant thereto. It is further contended that the petitioner is a young person aged about 24 years,



having clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.06.2025, investigation stands completed and challan has already been presented before the trial Court on 20.08.2025. It is also argued that all the prosecution witnesses are police officials and therefore, there is no likelihood of the petitioner influencing the witnesses or tampering with the prosecution evidence. Learned counsel also submits that the earlier bail application filed before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram was dismissed vide order dated 22.09.2025 without properly appreciating the facts and circumstances of the case.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the present petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 24.06.2025 and that the investigation stands completed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the custody certificate produced on record.

6. The petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 17 days. The allegations against the present petitioner are primarily to the effect that he was allegedly part of the group which had planned to commit the offence of looting a truck on National Highway-48. As per the prosecution case itself, the petitioner was not apprehended from the spot where the



alleged firing incident took place and no allegation of opening fire upon the police party has been attributed to him. Rather, the allegations regarding firing are specifically against co-accused Kaushal. The petitioner was allegedly arrested later from village Heraheri on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused persons and admittedly, no recovery of any weapon or other incriminating article has been effected from his conscious possession.

7. This Court further notices that the petitioner has been nominated in the present case mainly on the basis of the secret information and disclosure statements of co-accused. The investigation already stands completed, challan has been presented and charges have also been framed. As per the status report filed by the State, there are total 23 prosecution witnesses, however, not even a single witness has been examined till date. Thus, the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

8. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and considering the custody period of the petitioner, the nature of allegations, the fact that no recovery has been effected from him, the manner in which he has been implicated and the fact that the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner Ranjit @ Gaurav is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his not being required in any other case.



10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.
11. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

12.05.2026

neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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