



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

**CRM-M No.26671 of 2026
Date of decision: 15.05.2026**

Sombir Foji

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present :- Mr. Sansar Kundu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Senior DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Yashveer Kharb, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.104 dated 25.02.2026, under Sections 140(2), 310(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 (corresponding to Sections 364-A & 395 IPC) and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Hansi, District Hansi.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR which was, initially, registered against an unknown person. He further contends that even during the investigation, the police could not collect any evidence against him, and he has been



apprehended merely on the basis of suspicion. Also he is an ex-service man and the police has wrongly shown the recovery of a double-barrel .315 bore gun, a .32 bore pistol, and an arms licence from him. He further submits that the said two licensed weapons were lawfully possessed by him and he had not used the said weapons, as alleged in the FIR. He also submits that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 27.02.2026 and has been in custody since then. He also submits that after the completion of the investigation, the challan has already been presented against him. He further refers to the affidavit (Annexure P-3) of the complainant to contend that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties and there are bleak chances of conviction in the present case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last two months and the challan has already been presented against him. Moreover, the petitioner is a first-time offender and was never involved in any criminal activity in the past. Furthermore, the parties have also settled the dispute between them.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be



released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

15.05.2026
seema

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE