



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

206

**CRM-M-10049-2026
Date of decision: 19.05.2026**

FAKRU @ FAKARU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Munfaid Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 151 dated 10.06.2020, registered under Section(s) 279, 336, 307, 427, 34 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860; Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 13(2) of the Haryana Gouvansh Sanrakshan and Gausamvardhan Act, 2015 at Police Station Kasola, District Rewari after the earlier bail petition had been withdrawn on 24.07.2025.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, SI Om Parkash was present along with other police officials at Kasola Chowk, Rewari. A V.T. Message was then received that on Gadhi Bolni Road, from the side of Dawana, one

pickup had loaded the cows and bulls and was proceeding to Village Khedi Motla and if barricading was done, they could be apprehended. Relying on the same, barricading was done whereafter one pickup was seeing coming from the side of Dawana and on being signalled to stop, the Driver of the vehicle accelerated the vehicle and broke the barricade. The Police Party chased the pickup and after some time, the rear tyre of the pickup got burst. Four young boys jumped from the said vehicle and one of them fired upon the Police party. However, they ran away from the spot after leaving the vehicle by taking advantage of darkness. On search of the pickup, two cows and three bulls, tied with ropes, were found and taken into Police possession.

3. Counsel contends that the petitioner is neither the owner nor did he drive the aforesaid vehicle and that he was arrested in the aforesaid case on the basis of a disclosure by the co-accused on 09.05.2025. He has been in custody since then and already a period of more than 01 year has lapsed. Only 04 witnesses out of 24 witnesses have been examined so far. From the last 10 dates, none of the witnesses have appeared before the Court. He further submits that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner.

4. Learned State Counsel contends that the petitioner is alleged to have fire a shot at the Police Party even though no one was injured in the said incident. He, however, does not dispute that no weapon has been recovered from the petitioner but offers an explanation that as per the disclosure, the said weapon was destroyed by the petitioner, hence, offence under Section 201 IPC was added. He contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the disclosure of co-accused Amjad, who had purchased the vehicle from Kuldeep in whose name the pickup had been

registered and who got recorded a statement to the effect that he had sold the vehicle on a power of attorney to Amjad.

5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration the actual period of custody of more than 01 year in the present case, coupled with the stage of the trial, absence of any recovery and arguable issues with respect to involvement of the petitioner which are required to be gone into at the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 19, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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