



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

112

CRM-M-13000-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.03.2026

Ajay ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Sunil K. Dhanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.44 dated 08.02.2024, registered under Sections 25(1) B, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar Jind, District Jind, Haryana.
2. Succintly, present petition seeking anticipatory bail has been filed as petitioner was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, from whose possession two country-made pistols were recovered. Allegedly, petitioner had supplied the recovered weapons for consideration of Rs.10,000/-.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The FIR in the present case was registered on 08.02.2024, challan was filed on 24.12.2024, and



prosecution moved application for issuance of arrest warrants on 24.12.2025, i.e. one year after filing of challan. Petitioner has been implicated on solely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence, and there is no other evidence to link the petitioner with the commission of offence in the present case. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, submitting that he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as the co-accused has nominated him as the supplier of the illegal weapons. It is further contended that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and is not a law-abiding citizen. The petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to collect evidence for the successful prosecution of the case.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, particularly the allegation against the petitioner that he is the supplier of the illegal weapons recovered from the possession of the co-accused, which he supplied for a consideration of Rs.10,000/-; as submitted by learned State counsel, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for effective investigation; and further considering that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and is involved in criminal activities, this Court does not deem it a fit case to extend the extra-ordinary

concession of anticipatory bail as anticipatory bail is an extraordinary relief, to be granted sparingly, only in exceptional cases deserving of the concession.

9. Custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is necessary for effecting a proper and in-depth investigation in the case. Hon’ble Apex Court in *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by anticipatory bail, wherein interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

10. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

11. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

11.03.2026

Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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