



CRM-M-33555-2025

203

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

**CRM-M-33555-2025
Decided on : 30.01.2026**

Sandeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Karan Duggal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner- Sandeep, aged 30 years has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 31, dated 11.01.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 111(2)(b), 111(5), 121(1), 132, 221 of BNS and Section 29/25(1-B)a/54 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Azad Nagar Hisar, District Hisar, Haryana.

2. As per case of the prosecution, police patrolling team while searching for an accused namely Yash S/o Rajpal in connection with the case FIR No. 7 dated 06.01.2025, under Sections 109(1), 351(3), 3(5) BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Sadar, Bhiwani, a reliable informant met them and gave information that, the incident carried out approximately 4/5 days ago in village Khark, Bhiwani by gangster Rohit Godara, the wanted criminal-Yash, alongwith his associates, was travelling in a white-colored i20 car, and heading



CRM-M-33555-2025

2

from Siwani towards village Gorchhi, Hisar via village Chaudhriwas. Further informed that they are roaming around with the intention of committing another crime for the gangster Rohit Godara.

When the police party proceeded to intercept the named accused Yash, an alleged encounter took place near village Chaudhriwa (Hisar). At that time, two unidentified accomplices were reportedly moving in a white i20 car with intent to commit further crime, on the instructions of gangster-Rohit Godara. During an alleged police naka, accused Yash reportedly stepped out of his vehicle, shouted to his accomplices, and fired directly at the police with intent to kill. One bullet hit the bullet proof jacket of the complainant, SI Naresh Kumar. In retaliation, the police fired shots in which accused Yash suffered injuries and was, subsequently apprehended on the spot. After being arrested, he disclosed the names of his two other associates namely Pradeep r/o village Gorchhi, Hisar and Doody, r/o Bachhra, Hisar. Further, prosecution developed its case that after arrest of accused-Yash @ Pola, he got recorded the disclosure statement revealing complete name of Pradeep as Pradeep @ Chairman and the other associate is Sandeep @ Doody (present petitioner). Consequently, petitioner Sandeep @ Doody was arrested on 20.05.2025. Based on his disclosure statements dated 21.01.2025 and 23.05.2025, the investigating officer again recovered a .32 bore pistol, 5 cartridges and i20 car and lastly, final report was also submitted against him on 17.04.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that after submission of final report, charges were framed on 28.05.2025 and out of total 33 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined till date. It is further argued that except of disclosure statement of co-accused Yash @ Pola, naming therein the petitioner

**CRM-M-33555-2025**

being involved in the incident of encounter and also the alleged recovery of weapons based on a disclosure statement made while he was in custody, no other evidence has been collected during investigation to fortify his involvement in the present crime. Further argues that even if the allegations are taken to be correct at its face value, petitioner is not assigned an active role in causing any injury to any police officer. Otherwise also, the disclosure statements of the accused are of no consequence except regarding the recovery of pistol, cartridges and car. Thus, submits that trial is likely to take considerable time as around 30 more prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, thus, prays for grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that petitioner belongs to a gang of hardcore criminals led by Rohit Godara. By referring to paragraph No. 13 of the status report, it is pointed out that there are five other cases registered against the petitioner and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for concession of bail.

5. I have considered the submission made by learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record placed before this Court.

6. Undoubtedly, the petitioner is explained to be involved in five criminal cases and details are as under:

(i) FIR No.351/2023, under sections 25(1-b) of Arms Act, P.S. Sadar Hisar. In Custody.

(ii) FIR No.237/2024, under sections 25(7), 25(6) of Arms Act and Section 120-B of IPC, P.S. Civil Lines Hisar. On Bail

(iii) FIR No. 93/2024, under sections 380, 411 of IPC, P.S. City Fatehabad. On Bail

(iv) FIR No.680/2020, under sections 61 of Excise Act, P.S. HTM Hisar. On Bail



CRM-M-33555-2025

4

(v) FIR No.338/2020, under sections 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC and section 61 of Excise Act, P.S. Azad Nagar, Hisar. On Bail

7. At this stage, learned State counsel has placed on record custody certificate dated 29.01.2026 and submits that petitioner is, infact, facing a total of nine cases rather than five. Since the criminal cases, which are detailed in the status report, having been filed in the shape of affidavit of Kamaljeet Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, H.Q. Hisar. Undoubtedly, two of the cases are under the Arms Act, third one is for the offence of theft, fourth one is under the Excise Act and last one is of cheating and fraud. All these five cases are triable by the Court of Magistrate.

8. It is also pointed out by the petitioner's counsel that out of these five cases, according to the status report, the petitioner is out on bail in all cases except FIR No. 351/2023. Till date the petitioner has not been convicted in any of the cases registered against him. Furthermore, the petitioner's role in the present case, if any, involved, is yet to be established. The petitioner is inside jail since 21.01.2025 i.e. for the last more than one year and only three prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 33 prosecution witnesses. Additionally, the petitioner has not caused injury to any police official, nor are there other such allegations against him. The question of identification is also likely to arise during course of trial.

9. Considering all the aforementioned aspects and the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties, and the facts borrowed from the record, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned



CRM-M-33555-2025

trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned,
if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

13. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

January 30, 2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO