



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

229

CRM-M-13629-2026
Date of decision: 01.04.2026

AKHLAK

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of ‘the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023’. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.154 dated 01.10.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 121(1), 221, 132, 109(1) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Police Station Bichhor, District Nuh.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of Inspector ‘Sandeep Kumar’. It was reported by the above-named police officer that on 01.10.2025, he was leading a team of police official looking for the arrest of accused ‘Akhlak’ son ‘Yakub’



wanted in FIR No.149 dated 27.09.2025 for the commission of offence under Sections 190, 191(3), 115, 121(1), 132, 221, 109(1) & 324(4) of BNS, Section 25-54-59 Arms Act and Section 3 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, Police Station Bichhor, District Nuh. According to the police officer, the above-named accused was seen pelting stones at a police party in an incident which was captured in a video camera. The above-said police officer further reported that there a tip-off was given by a reliable source that the above-named accused (petitioner herein) would visit Punhana on that day, and would pass through the road behind the Government Hospital.

3. The above-named police officer further reported that in view of above-mentioned information a picket was deputed on the road behind Government Hospital and a barricade was raised. According to above-named police officer after 10-15 minutes a motorcycle without number plate was spotted by the police team and on the identification of informer, the motorcyclist was signalled to stop but the above-said motorcyclist fired a gunshot directly at the police party with an intention to kill the police official. It was further reported by the above-named police officer that from the above-mentioned gunshot EHC Gajendra was narrowly saved. As per above-named police officer thereafter the motorcyclist tried to run away, but he was chased by the police party and in the above-mentioned chase when the motorcyclist did not stop despite firing in air and continued to fire upon the police party, in self defence he was shot in his leg by the police party, due to which he fell down and was ultimately apprehended. As per report illegal weapon was recovered form his possession.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above-



mentioned report formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

5. Reply and custody certificate have been filed by learned State counsel. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that in the FIR No.149 dated 27.09.2025 the name of the petitioner had not figured. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration and nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner.

8. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that in the present case except the police officer there is no independent witness to support the prosecution case, and that the instant case for the commission of offence under Section 307 IPC has been lodged without there being any injury on the person of any police officer. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has urged for the benefit of bail for the petitioner.

9. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. At the very out-set the learned State counsel has contended that in the present petition for bail false averments have been made by the petitioner, as in para No.12, it has been mentioned that only one criminal case is pending against the petitioner, whereas in addition to FIR No.149 dated 01.10.2025 the petitioner is also facing prosecution in four other cases. According to learned State counsel, since the present petition is based upon false averments, the



same is bound to be dismissed on this ground itself.

10. In addition to above, the learned State counsel has also contended that otherwise also in the present case the events which had unfolded during the course of commission of crime itself makes it abundantly clear that the petitioner is a hardened criminal, who has been involved in various kinds of offences including attempt to commit murder, destruction of public property, fraud/cheating and extortion. According to learned State counsel in view of past conduct of the petitioner, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail. In support of his arguments, the learned State counsel has referred to the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Ash Mohammad vs. Shiv Raj Singh @ Lalla Babu and another' 2013(1) RCR(Criminal) 277.

11. The record has been perused carefully.

12. A perusal of record shows that in the present case the averments made in the petition itself are not true as an attempts has been made by the petitioner to mislead the Court by projecting that he is facing prosecution in one case only, but as per status report submitted by the learned State counsel, there are five other cases (in addition to present case), wherein the petitioner is being prosecuted. Otherwise also the record shows that the total custody period of the petitioner is approximately six months only and the allegations against the petitioner are that he had fired multiple gunshots on the police party and the firing of gunshot irrespective of injury can safely be inferred as attempt to commit murder.

13. Thus, taking into consideration the overall conduct of the petitioner and the gravity of offence, it is hereby observed that the petitioner is



not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition deserves dismissal.
Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
vipin

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