



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(218)

CRM-M-8084-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 12.01.2026

Netrapal @ Netra

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Abhimanyu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.511 dated 06.11.2024 under Sections 25(6) and (7) of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 06.11.2024, the police patrolling party, on receipt of a secret information qua accused/petitioner, conducted a raid and the petitioner was apprehended; on checking accused/petitioner, one country made pistol was recovered from right pocket of his jeans. Alongwith petitioner, co-accused Avinash @ Ronak was also apprehended, from whose left pocket of the jeans two live cartridges were found. Hence, the impugned FIR was registered against the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of total seventeen prosecution witnesses none has been examined; trial will take long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the

accused/petitioner behind the bar, and out of total eleven cases pending



against him, two cases are pending while in nine cases, he has been acquitted of the charges levelled against him, hence, prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the bail application by relying upon Status report filed by way of an affidavit of Sh. Vinod Kumar, HPS, Asstt. Commissioner of Police, Badhkal, Faridabad, that eleven other cases are pending against the petitioner, however, fairly admitted that two cases are still pending but in nine cases, he has been acquitted of the charge levelled against him; petitioner has undergone sentence in one case under Section 174-A IPC; offences alleged are punishable with 10 years of imprisonment and are serious offences, hence, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. Having considered facts and circumstances of the case and heard learned counsel for the parties, as the petitioner is in custody from 06.11.2024, the instant petition stands disposed off with a direction to the Trial Court to expedite the conclusion of trial preferably within a period of 3 months from the next date of hearing fixed before it. If the trial Court fails to conclude the trial within the stipulated period, then the petitioner would be at liberty to move an appropriate application seeking grant of bail before the Trial Court. Upon such application being filed, the Trial Court shall release the petitioner on bail subject to his furnishing requisite bonds to its satisfaction by imposing such condition that his presence can be secured during the trial as the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year.

It is made clear that if the delay in the trial is caused on the part of the petitioner/accused, then he shall not be entitled for the aforesaid relief.

12.01.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasonedYes/No

Whether reportableYes/No